Post-Classical Performance Culture and the Ancient Greek Novel

Bentley, Gillian Granville

Awarding institution:
King's College London

POST-CLASSICAL PERFORMANCE CULTURE AND THE ANCIENT GREEK NOVEL

Gillian Granville Bentley
PhD Classics Research

Abstract

Scholars have focused mainly on the sophisticated and specifically literary elements of the novel, revealing a staggering amount of intertextual traffic between the novels and canonical authors from Homer to Herodotus to Plato to Menander. While this (very successful) endeavour has raised the value of the novels' 'cultural capital', it has generally neglected another important aspect of the genre—the so-called 'low', 'sub-literary' influences on the novels. No work of art exists in a cultural vacuum—as work on intertextuality has shown, novelists like Achilles Tatius and Chariton were familiar with not only Homer and Plato but with contemporary intellectual culture. It seems more than possible that their knowledge would have extended beyond the textual and into the performance culture of the time.

The principle concern of my thesis is the question of why the novel is so performative and theatrical. I explore the performance culture influences on three ancient Greek novels—the *Callirhoe* of Chariton of Aphrodisias, *Leucippe and Clitophon* of Achilles Tatius, and the *Aethiopica* of Heliodorus. Each novel makes use of 'theatre' metaphorically but also practically and narratologically. The impact of performance culture extends beyond the influence of scripted literary dramatic texts and engages with the broader forms of performance—from mime and pantomime to public speaking. I demonstrate that 'sub-literary' performance serves as vibrant, important dialogic partner for the novels, a voice to be heard among the medley of other 'languages' (Bahktin's *heteroglossia*), if we but listen. By no means do I reveal any uncontaminated evidence for mime or pantomime within the novels, but multiply filtered reflections of popular performance traditions. I suggest that the novel authors composed with performance models in mind or with a sustained, explicit dialectic with performative intertexts.

Table Of Contents

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to the friends and family who have supported me throughout my degree. My parents Greg and Caroline, sister Meredith and brothers Andrew and Perry have had nothing but confidence in me, which has given me confidence in myself. Julia Coym, Chris Farrell, Erin Northey, Luke Richardson, Andy Roberts and Shannon Todd shared their time and their observations. Costas Panayotakis was kind enough to comment on an early chapter. Mike Trapp and Edith Hall reviewed drafts of my work at crucial stages and their input has been invaluable. Mike also generously gave his time at the end of this process, for which I am particularly grateful. Ismene Lada-Richards has been a constant support. Her guidance has been vital and this thesis would be a much poorer work without her encouragement and insightfulness.

Introduction: A Performance in the Mind's Eye

Greek Novels, Performance Intertexts

Boy and girl meet. They fall in love. They are captured by pirates. They are separated. They are reunited. Friends, family and entire cities rejoice. This is the general formula of the ancient Greek novels, based on the five extant texts considered the 'ideal' novels.[1] It is no surprise that these novels have a reputation for being 'theatrical'.[2] They abound with over-the-top emotion and improbable coincidences and seem formulated to amaze the reader with spectacular scenes. These very characteristics that make the novels memorable and engrossing contributed to their poor reputation in terms of literary merit.[3] B. E. Perry claimed that the reason the Greek novel did not develop at the same pace as the modern novel and 'was rarely if ever exploited by the best minds of the age' was due to the strength of

> the restraining force of a dominant academic fashion, which refused to recognize anything that was not classical in kind, or learned, or intellectual, or informative.[4]

In a single swoop, he damns the novels in his attempt to defend the genre, implying the novels are not intellectual, not at all classical and not written by intelligent people.

The status of the novels has been greatly rehabilitated in the past 40 years, which have seen an explosion of scholarship on the topic.[5] A key aspect of this

[1] For recent full-length treatments of the 'ideal' novels, see Whitmarsh (2011), Montiglio (2012a). For novel fragments, see Stephens and Winkler (1995), Morgan (1998), Hägg and Utas (2003), Stephens (2003). Henrichs (2011) discusses how papyrus finds have redefined the boundaries of the Greek novel genre.
[2] Walden (1894), Rohde (1914), Perry (1967), Winkler (1980), Morgan (1992), Holzberg (1995), Bartsch (1989), Marion (1990), Mignogna (1996a, 1996b, 1997), Morales (2004: esp 71).
[3] Rohde (1914) and Perry (1967).
[4] Perry (1967: 8).
[5] The first ICAN (International Conference on the Ancient Novel), organised by B. P. Reardon at Bangor in 1976, could be considered a watershed moment. See Morgan (1996b) for summary of

rehabilitation has been the exploration of the 'sophistication' of the novels, which has frequently taken the form of identifying 'high' culture, especially 'classical', references in the texts.[6] Although the study of the novel has come far, it retains a bias towards highlighting the erudite and literary aspects of the texts. While this is certainly a valuable endeavour and has provided numerous insights into the texts, this emphasis on 'high' culture has neglected subliterary aspects of the novels, particularly subliterary performance.[7] Arthur Heiserman claims the genre 'filled a gap left by the disappearance of worthy drama in its time', disparaging Hellenistic and imperial performance but not necessarily classifying the novel as an equal to the classical drama whose gap it filled. Later novel scholars have leaned in the opposite direction to Perry, redeeming the novels by emphasising the 'classical' elements. Most previous studies of 'drama' and the novels have focused on the 'high' culture, literary intersection with tragedy and comedy, particularly quotations and allusions.[8] While these are certainly important literary intertexts for the novels, they are not the only 'language' of drama or performance found in these works.

---

scholarship from the first ICAN to 1996 and Morgan (2008a) for a summary of scholarship between 1989 and 2008.

[6] For example, Feuillätre (1966), Borgogno (1971), Garson (1975), Fusillo (1989), Fusillo (1991), Ruiz-Montero (1991a), Paulsen (1992), Montes Cala (1992), Marini (1993), Daude (1994), Dworacki (1996), Laplace (1997) Crismani (1997), Pletcher (1998), Couraud-Lalanne (1998), McGill (2000), Robiano (2000), Kapparis (2001), Hirschberger (2001), Mason (2002), Liapis (2006), Laplace (2007), Repath (2007), Webb (2007), Liapis (2008), Elmer (2008), De Temmerman (2009), Trzaskoma (2009), Scourfield (2010), Trzaskoma (2010), Repath (2011), Doulamis (2011a), Montiglio (2012a).

[7] Two recent exceptions are Webb, Bowie, and Kim's contributions to Whitmarsh and Thomson (2013), which discuss the importance of mime, Milesian tales and folklore. Anderson (1982) retains value judgments regarding 'low' culture but does attempt to identify a variety of sources beyond 'high' culture. I find Anderson (1996) contains similar judgments but also acknowledges that there is no hard boundary between 'popular' and 'sophisticated'. See also Andreassi (1997).

[8] For example, Feuillätre (1966), Borgogno (1971), Marino (1990), Fusillo (1989), Fusillo (1991), Paulsen (1992), Montes Cala (1992), Marini (1993), Daude (1994), Dworacki (1996), Laplace (1997) Crismani (1997), Pletcher (1998), Robiano (2000), Kapparis (2001), Hirschberger (2001), Mason (2002), Liapis (2006), Laplace (2007), Liapis (2008), Trzaskoma (2009), Scourfield (2010), Trzaskoma (2010), Montiglio (2012a).

I have used the term 'subliterary' and will continue to use it to describe the popular performances of the Hellenistic and Imperial periods. The novels require further investigation into their relationship with the live performance contexts and subliterary influences contemporary with the novelists. Examining these oft-neglected subliterary intertexts provides even richer readings of the texts. I concentrate on live performance and performance culture, although I will address dramatic literature, particularly Classical tragedy and New and Roman comedy, particularly in their relationship to later genres. I focus my research on three of the five 'ideal' novels: Chariton's *Callirhoe*, Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon* and Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*. They each represent one the three 'periods' into which the novels are often divided,[9] and are the novels with the most to gain from an examination of subliterary performance, though both Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* and Xenophon of Ephesus' *Ephesiaca* probably contain subliterary performance material, but not perhaps to the same extent.[10] The closest works to my study are both based on Latin literature, Costas Panayotakis' work on Petronius and Regine May's treatment of drama and Apuleius.[11] Their efforts have shown that an extended treatment of performance in the Latin novels provides fruitful insights into the works. Previous studies have focused on the novels' affinities with performance, but do not emphasise the elements of live, subliterary performance.[12] Heliodorus in particular has been the subject of study for its tragic and comic quotations and theatrical language, and Shadi Bartsch's invaluable study of *ekphrasis* also touches on the novel's

[9] Most recently, see Whitmarsh (2012).
[10] Robert (2012) discusses pantomime in Longus.
[11] Panayotakis (1995), May (2006).
[12] Fusillo (1991: 31-54), Crismani (1997), Brethes (2007a). Marino (1990) perhaps comes closest with her study of Heliodorus.

spectacles.[13] Ruth Webb's very recent chapter on mime in the novel aligns closely with my study of some aspects of that novel, and illustrates that there is a need for an extended study of subliterary performance influences.[14] She also mentions episodes from Achilles Tatius, which have been examined in three intriguing articles by Elisa Mignogna.[15] Chariton has garnered the least attention in terms of subliterary interference.[16]

In my thesis I further these lines of investigation and extend the treatment of 'theatricality' and performance genres, hoping to lay open other aspects of a reader's horizon of expectations beyond other texts he has read. Rather than seek to prove the erudition of the author or reader, I seek to place emphasis on the contexts of popular culture, elements that would have been accessible to most readers.[17] The authors engage with performance theory and dramatic tropes in ways that could be seen to challenge performance genres. They provide bigger spectacles and more impossible situations, with the world as their stage, and present themselves as dramatists. Subliterary allusions and the building blocks of performance provide scaffolding on which a reader can build his vision of the

[13] Walden (1894), Bartsch (1989), Marino (1990), Paulsen (1992), Dworacki (1996), Winkler (2001), Montiglio (2013). Morgan (1992) has discussed internal and external audiences in the novel.
[14] Webb (2013).
[15] Mignogna (1996a), (1996b), (1997).
[16] García Gual (1975) claims that Chariton is a 'historical novel' and not realistic, so therefore unrelated to what he considers the mundane matters of mime. Bentley (2013) mentions the possibility of adultery mime as an intertext in Chariton.
[17] There has been considerable debate regarding the readership of the novel, and I hold with current scholarly consensus that novel readers were not a separate, lowbrow group but were instead the educated élite. I use the masculine pronoun in reference to the reader not in order to exclude the possibility of female readership, but rather for readability. 'He' is used in an inclusive, almost neuter, sense and should be considered along the same lines as the less readable (in my opinion) 's/he'. It is not possible to prove whether the novels were targeted at a particular gender, and I assume the target audience is those people who had access to a literary education, male or female. For further discussion of readership see Bowie (1990a) and (1994), Stephens (1994) and Hunter (2008). Wesseling (1988) and Hägg (1994) discuss the possibility of a broader audience. Egger (1999) and Haynes (2003) are useful resources on female readership. See Johnson (2010) for a recent general study of Imperial readership.

text and enhance his own reading pleasure. I argue the novelists use theatricality to help their readers bring the text to life in a performance for the mind's eye.

Although we tend to use the terms 'high' and 'low' culture as if they clearly defined and demarcated categories, in antiquity these cultural boundaries were permeable.[18] While in their writings the élites could disparage the mobs of pantomime spectators alongside the performers of mime and pantomime themselves,[19] in practice such spectacles were cheered by the élites just as much as by the masses. Moreover, because 'low' culture was the lowest common denominator, able to be enjoyed and understood by all, the élites were happy to exploit it in order to communicate with larger audiences, unhomogeneous with respect to class and educational capital.[20] So, for example, Cicero and even Augustine can mention mime and pantomime in the certainty that their audiences would understand,[21] while Christians speaking against the theatre appropriated theatrical themes and declamatory techniques in order to entertain and retain their audiences.[22] Élite orators turned the myths of fifth century tragedies into educated discourse, while the same material in the hands of the pantomime dancer became the stuff of popular culture. As such, it is perhaps not fruitful to acknowledge only the 'high' culture aspect of a topic. Webb notes that 'canonical classical texts, for all the respect paid to them, were not seen as untouchable monuments but as sources of material, as spurs to emulation.'[23] The

[18] Anderson (1996), Andreassi (1997: 19), Gianotti (1986: 96).
[19] Aelius Aristides, *Or.* 34.55; Seneca, *Natural Questions* 7.32.1-3.
[20] Lada-Richards (2008) investigates this paradox.
[21] Cicero, *Pro Cael.* 65; Augustine, *Sermones* 241.5= *PL* 38,1135-6.
[22] Cameron (1991: 47-88), Longosz (1997), Leyerle (2001: 6).
[23] Webb (2009: 23).

novelists borrow from classical texts, but they may also borrow from earlier borrowings—the chain of receptions[24] need not contain only one link.

'Homer' serves as a good example of an intertext that is not as simple as it first appears. All three novels in my study interact with Homer, and the *Odyssey* in particular is an extremely important intertext for the novel genre.[25] Homeric themes were not found only in editions of the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad*. Homer was a part of élite education, through reading of texts, but also by providing topics for school room debate and fodder for professional declaimers. These same élite topics were reenacted by the so-called Homerists, thus turning even the highest pinnacle of literary production into material of, if not an entirely subliterary, then not a completely literary performance.[26] The 'theatricalisation' of Homeric episodes (like the pantomime versions of tragic subjects) gave them a share in popular culture, but the literary cachet of their material ensured they retained a foothold in élite culture. Recognising the numerous frames of reference for 'Homer' enriches a reading of the novels, and shows that topics need not be regarded as belonging to a single context. Even when it is easy to identify a specific intertext like 'Homer', in reality this intertext is not simple but variegated and multiple, because it is made up of several different strands related to the same source material. In the novelists' time, 'Homer' does not only mean 'the' text, in the same way that Euripides' *Medea* does not only mean 'the' textual Medea.

[24] Martindale (1993: 7), Martindale (2004).
[25] Morgan (2008b: 220), 'The *Odyssey*, with its combination of travel adventures and marital reunion validated as a correct narrative destination, is the principal foundation-text of romance.' To greater or lesser degree, and with varying degrees of specificity, all the novels are descants on the second Homeric epic.'
[26] Homerists will be discussed in greater detail in the following chapter.

Theatricality

Theatricality, a little like pornography,[27] is perhaps easier to recognise than to define. Tracy Davis and Thomas Postlewait explain:

> The idea of theatricality has achieved an extraordinary range of meanings, making it everything from an act to an attitude, a style to a semiotic system, a medium to a message… Depending on one's perspective, it can be dismissed as little more than a self-referential gesture or it can be embraced as a definitive feature of human communication.[28]

'Theatrical' can be a catch-all adjective to cover the impressions received when reading a Greek novel, but it does little to identify or interrogate the 'how' or 'why'. The levels of theatricality within the novels are manifold and do not fit a single narrow definition of the term. My thesis seeks to identify the many tangled layers of theatricality contained in the novels and make use of the term's 'protean flexibility that lends richness to both historical study and theoretical analysis'.[29] Chariton, Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus use technical theatrical terms, apply dramatic theory, present 'performances' or scenes in which characters take on roles that disguise their true identities or intentions, and allude to performance genres. All of these contribute to the theatricality of the narratives, and many have been studied before. Rarely, however, have those studies taken into account live performance contexts and subliterary genres.

Thomas Paulsen lists two groups of theatrical vocabulary found in Heliodorus.[30] Though Heliodorus uses the most theatrical terms, the categories can be applied across all three novels. The first group contains words and adjectives for theatrical performances—such as δρᾶμα, κωμῳδία, τραγικὴ

[27] U.S. Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart, Jacobellis v. Ohio (1964), famously wrote that he would not attempt to define hard-core pornography, 'but I know it when I see it'.
[28] Davis and Postlewait (2003: 1).
[29] Davis and Postlewait (2003: 4).
[30] Paulsen (1992: 22).

ποίησις, κωμικός and τραγικός. Though δρᾶμα has a diversity of meanings, it certainly has ties to the theatre.[31] The other four words are most explicitly theatrical in that they refer to specific types of dramatic production or describe something as like a dramatic genre. Paulsen splits his second section of vocabulary into subgroups: theatrical space (θέατρον, σκηνή), technical terms (μηχανή, ἐπεισκυκλεῖν), directing (σκηνοποιία, σκηνογραφικός, σκηνογραφεῖν), audience (θέατρον), scene as scenery (σκηνή) and words that relate to performance (προσωπεῖον, ὑπόκρισις, τραγῳδεῖν, ἐπιτραγῳδεῖν).[32] Vocabulary is of course an important marker of theatricality and naturally one of the easiest for a reader to identify—one is likely to understand a scene is like tragedy if the author says so. Paulsen's second group of words is more subtle. They are associated with theatre and can be taken literally or metaphorically. Theatrical vocabulary is not necessarily as cut and dried as Paulsen presents it—though he may associate certain terms with specific performance genres, in his case classical tragedy and New Comedy, the words may not have had the same resonance for an ancient reader. For example, τραγικός was used to describe not just classical tragedy but also pantomime, a hugely popular genre.[33] While technical theatrical terms may produce images in the scholar's mind of a certain hilltop in Athens, this is anachronistic and does not reflect the contemporary theatrical milieu in which novel readers and writers were immersed.[34] It does not mean that ancient readers were unfamiliar with the plots or mechanics of

[31] Walden (1894: 2-25) discusses the meanings of δρᾶμα in Heliodorus, Achilles Tatius and Chariton.
[32] Dworacki (1996: 356) reproduces this list word for word in English with the same Greek examples.
[33] See chapter one.
[34] Reardon (1994: 176) referring to Chariton, says that the author 'is writing in the cultural context of his day, namely dramatic spectacle of one kind or another: Hellenistic drama, or excerpts from Classics, or mime.'

classical tragedy or New comedy, but these were not the sole theatrical references possible to readers who also had completely different live performances within their cultural discourse.

After the vocabulary of theatrical practice comes the language of theatrical theory. The novelists evince an awareness of ideas about performance which can be seen in the apparent implementation of or interaction with dramatic theory. As I will show in the second chapter, Chariton, Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus appear to engage with Hellenistic dramatic theory. The novelists seem to comment on the poetics of the novel genre.[35] This exploration of the novels' place within genre and aesthetics can be seen in their engagement with and potential rejection of tragic poetics. The novelists grapple with the power and impact of *pathos* and defend the appeal of a happy and romantic ending. It is impossible to prove a direct dialogue between the novelists and literary or dramatic theory,[36] yet an educated reader would perhaps have been able to bring his knowledge of peripatetic theory to bear on these instances in the text.

The novels also show evidence of interacting with the principles and mechanics of live performance. Subliterary elements would be far more accessible, reaching a wider portion of the reading audience and enhancing a reader's experience as much or more than the potential recognition of aspects of peripatetic theory. The novelists appear to imitate techniques found in the theatre, even as they occasionally place their characters within actual theatres. These elements could be recognised not only by the extremely erudite but also by readers accustomed to live performance and the conventions of the stage. In a very basic sense, a scene is theatrical when it contains the irreducible

[35] Egger (1999: 115), Tilg (2010: esp. 130-32).
[36] Paschalis (2013).

components of a performance, that is to say a performer and an audience. Each of the novels provides numerous situations in which a crowd witnesses the actions of other characters, serving as the 'inbuilt' audience to public processions, marriage ceremonies, funerals, acts of physical prowess, court trials and public speeches. Although we do not always have explicit references to the stage at such points, the mere existence and manipulation of a performer/audience dynamic at crucial moments in the novel plots engages the reader in an interaction with the narrative that escapes the confines of the 'written' page.

These vibrant interchanges produce a quintessentially theatrical effect, the arousal of emotions in both the internal audience and the reader. These very emotions are similar to those identified by Aristotle as belonging to the experience of *catharsis*, the pain and pleasure stimulated by *mimêsis*.[37] Not every spectacle is engineered to influence the opinions of its audience, though they do evoke strong emotional reactions, ranging from wonder to disbelief, joy to agony. Quintilian contends that the aim of rhetorical performance was to control the emotions rather than the thoughts of audience members.[38] It would appear that the novels shared that goal. Though emotions can surely sway audience opinion, for the novelists the first aim is simply to stir up emotion.[39] Making an audience *feel* is the goal of such performances, and as Aristotle claims for tragedy, the experience of overwhelming emotions is pleasurable. The novels use theatricality to entertain and delight their readers through these emotional highs and lows.

[37] Aristotle, *Poetics* 1453b, 1448b.
[38] Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.* 11.3.2; Scodel (1997: 501), Conolly (2001: 84-88), Webb (1997b).
[39] Fusillo (1999).

The novels are not set on a literal stage but rather portray the lives of 'ordinary' individuals. They often show a form of theatricality found in everyday life, such as when a person chooses to shape their behaviour in order to influence the responses of his audience.[40] The person usually employs language and formulas familiar to the audience that will encourage them to respond as the 'actor' would like. The protagonists use theatricality to influence other characters within the novels. They wear disguises, tell elaborate stories, at times crossing the line between exaggeration and falsehood. These examples fall into Chaniotis' description of theatricality as

> the effort of individuals or groups to construct an image of themselves which is at least in part deceiving, because it either is in contrast to reality or because it exaggerates or partly distorts reality.[41]

His interpretation is not far from ancient thought regarding performance, as deception (ἀπάτη) plays an important role in ancient conceptions of drama. As Lada-Richards explains, Greek culture is 'keenly aware' of the two ways in which theatrical representation can be understood, as a positive or negative force.[42] At times a similar anxiety can be found within the novels.[43] Although at times theatricality is used to harm the protagonists,[44] theatricality in the hands of the protagonists is usually a life (or chastity) preserving measure, or, in the case

[40] Burns (1972: 33).
[41] Chaniotis (1997: 222).
[42] Lada-Richards (2003: 56, 36-37) 'provided that Greek theatre is carefully contextualised, it can be seen to encode self-consciously a variety of anti-theatrical perspectives, most importantly clustering around the deceitful nature of representation frames and the ambiguous status of the actor, continuously engaged in the business of pretending to be somebody other than himself'. For more general studies of theatricality and anti-theatricality see Davis and Postlewait (2003) and Barish (1981).
[43] Chariklea's warning to Theagenes in Heliodorus (7.21.4) reveals her uneasiness about acting a role.
[44] For example the suitors' plot in *Callirhoe* book 1 and the actor/prisoner in Achilles Tatius (7.3.1-8). For anti-theatricality in the suitors' plot in Chariton, see Bentley (2013).

of Calasiris, a tool in the service of the greater good.[45] Conflicting views on performance can be found in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*, in which Neoptolemus is reluctant to deceive, while Odysseus argues that it is for the good of the Argives.[46]

One final aspect of theatricality found in the novels is allusions to performance genres, whether it be a tragic intertext or the possibility of pantomime interference. These allusions can serve as cues, encouraging readers to read a scene in light of performance. Although they can signal theatricality, not all allusions to performances or performance literature singlehandedly create a 'theatrical' moment. For example, when Callirhoe debates the fate of her unborn child and wonders if she will be like a Medea, it is not the reference to a mythological character found in tragedy that singlehandedly makes the situation theatrical, but rather the form of Callirhoe's deliberations: her heartfelt monologue.[47] As such, my focus is not on locating and commenting on every quotation or allusion to Classical tragedy,[48] but rather on identifying when such allusions add to the theatricality of certain episodes. When it comes to subliterary genres, an allusion need not refer to a specific performance but rather to a genre or theme. Subliterary performances were unlikely to be comprehensively scripted, and as with all live performance, scripted or not, no performance would be exactly the same as the one before. It is neither possible nor desirable to try to pinpoint a specific extant subliterary text as the only possible origin of an allusion. It is more enriching to explore multiple potential references than to seek only specific allusions to extant texts.

[45] For the ambiguous morality of Calasiris see Winkler (1982), Futre Pinheiro (1992), Dowden (1996).
[46] Sophocles, *Philoctetes* 55-120.
[47] Chariton *Callirhoe* 2.9.1-6.
[48] See Paulsen (1992) for such a treatment of Heliodorus.

The Powers of the Reader

Dio Chrysostom tells us that one day when he was ill, he chose to read Sophocles, Aeschylus and Euripides' versions of *Philoctetes*. Recounting the experience, he tells his own readers that he 'was magnificently entertained by the spectacle' as he read (εὐωχούμην τῆς θέας).[49] He describes his enjoyment of a text as if it were a visual experience, a θέα. His reading process is pointedly visual. He claims, 'I played *choregos* for myself in brilliant style and tried to pay close attention, as if I were a judge of the first tragic choruses' (ἐχορήγουν ἐμαυτῷ πάνυ λαμπρῶς καὶ προσέχειν ἐπειρώμην, ὥσπερ δικαστὴς τῶν πρώτων τραγικῶν χορῶν).[50] Dio makes performances from his reading material. It is not too far a leap—he is reading dramatic texts. And yet the performances he conjures are not any he has seen before, and he has missed the chance to see those 'first tragic choruses' by a matter of centuries. The scenes to which he pays careful and close attention are played out in his own imagination. He collaborates with the playwrights in creating his own entertainment, as if he were taking to heart Aristotle's advice for a dramatist on the workings of poetic imagination:

> δεῖ δὲ τοὺς μύθους συνιστάναι καὶ τῇ λέξει συναπεργάζεσθαι ὅ τι μάλιστα πρὸ ὀμμάτων τιθεμενον· οὕτω γὰρ ἂν ἐναργέστατα [ὁ] ὁρῶν ὥσπερ παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς γιγνόμενος τοῖς πραττομένοις εὑρίσκοι τὸ πρέπον καὶ ἥκιστα ἂν λανθάνοι [τὸ] τὰ ὑπεναντία.
>
> In composing plots and working them out in terms of verbal expression, the poet should, most of all, put things before his eyes, as he would see the events most vividly as if he were actually there, and would therefore find what is appropriate and be aware of the opposite.[51]

[49] Dio Chrysostom, *Or*. 52.3. All translations (and attending errors) are my own, with great debts owed to far more adept translators of the novels: Gaselee (1917), Maillon (1960), Goold (1995), and particularly Reardon (1989), Morgan (1989a), Winkler (1989), and Whitmarsh (2001).
[50] Dio Chrysostom, *Or*. 52.4.
[51] Aristotle, *Poetics* 1455a23-24.

When Dio sets the plays before his mind's eye, he does so as a reader, not as a composer. His efforts seem to be those of an ultra-sophisticated reader, one who sees the role of reader as akin to that of poet or *choregos.* It is as if the words on the page must be reconstituted into a performance for the mind in order to be fully enjoyable, making 'performance' a latent but just as important a dimension to dramatic literature as ever it was. Dio's whimsical depiction of his reading experience hints at visualising powers that may have accompanied a reading culture in keeping with a superior imperial education. His dramatic reading material easily lends itself to mental performances, but an ancient reader could bend such visualising powers to any kind of material, from dramatic literature, to speeches, to prose narratives like history and the Greek novel.[52] Lucian claims it is the task of the historian to describe events as vividly as possible (ἐναργέστατα), and Plutarch praises Xenophon for placing an event before the eyes of his readers and making them feel as if the past were in fact the present.[53] In his reading, Dio is the *choregos* who supplies the theatrical trappings, but also the judge, evaluating the texts as he interprets them. His mental stage-setting helps him process the text as thoroughly as possible.

Audiences were expected to imaginatively engage with a text. The conception that spoken or written words could create living images in the mind of their audience is an important one in antiquity. In reference to a passage in Cicero's *Verrine Orations*, Quintilian mentions the way a reader supplements a text. Quintilian asks:

> *an quisquam tam procul a concipiendis imaginibus rerum abest… non solum ipsos intueri videatur et locum et habitum, sed quaedam etiam ex iis, quae dicta non sunt, sibi ipse adstruat?*

[52] Zanker (1981), Walker (1993), Webb (1997b).
[53] Lucian, *How to Write History* 51; Plutarch, *Artaxerxes* 8.1.

> is there anyone so incapable of forming images of things [that he reads]…that he not only seems to look upon them, their location and appearance, but even adds for himself some things that were not mentioned.[54]

Quintilian presents this sort of visualisation and supplementation as more than just typical.[55] He observations suggests that a reader who does not visualise is substandard in some way. Dionysius of Halicarnassus reveals similar assumptions regarding the ideal visualising powers of the reader. In praise of Lysias' ability to create vividness, he claims:

> ὁ δὴ προσέχων τὴν διάνοιαν τοῖς Λυσίου λόγοις οὐχ οὕτως ἔσται σκαιὸς ἢ δυσάρεστος ἢ βραδὺς τὸν νοῦν, ὃς οὐχ ὑπολήψεται γινόμενα τὰ δηλούμενα ὁρᾶν καὶ ὥσπερ παροῦσιν οἷς ἂν ὁ ῥήτωρ εἰσάγῃ προσώποις ὁμιλεῖν.
>
> nobody who sets his mind towards the speeches of Lysias will be so clumsy, peevish or slow-witted that he will fail to feel like he sees the actions which are being described going on and like he is meeting face-to-face the characters the orator introduces.[56]

It was not exceptional but rather expected for a reader to be able to build a vivid mental image from the descriptions found in a text.[57]

Skilled composers like Lysias had a variety of rhetorical techniques at hand to create a scaffolding on which a reader could build his mental impressions. These techniques, though traditionally found in the art of rhetoric, can also be found in other literary genres. Rhetoric is frequently mentioned in discussions of the components or precursors of the ancient Greek novel.[58] Although scholarship has shifted away from the search for the novels' antecedents, rhetoric is certainly an influence on the novels, as it is on numerous literary and performance

[54] Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.* 8.3.64-5.
[55] Webb (2009: 21).
[56] Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Lysias* 7; see further Zanker (1981: 297).
[57] Webb (2009: 21-3), Konstan (2009: 13-14).
[58] Russell (1983), Anderson (1984), Anderson (1993: 31), Winkler (1994), Hock (1997), Webb (2007a).

genres.[59] As Ruth Webb has suggested, given the way in which rhetoric can dexterously handle labyrinthine premises, rhetorical theory may have 'provided a language within which to express the complexities and the paradoxes of fictional discourse'.[60] Considering rhetoric's status as a cornerstone of élite education, it is unsurprising that rhetorical tools and styles are found throughout ancient literature. Our best evidence for the shape of rhetorical education comes from the *progymnasmata* the exercises found in ancient rhetorical handbooks.[61] The *progymnasmata* 'can provide one set of clues to the cultural and intellectual background of a work and to the basic assumptions about language and representation which inform the text.'[62] These works not only define rhetorical techniques but also reveal expectations of the kinds of audience responses that rhetoric was intended to provoke.

Ancient writers attempted to elicit specific audience reactions by employing detailed descriptions and emotionally charged accounts of events. One rhetorical device in particular, *ekphrasis*, was associated with placing images before the eyes. As defined in the handbooks, an *ekphrasis* has no prescribed length or subject matter, can be verse or prose, but it must bring its subject 'before the eyes', turning listeners into spectators.'[63] One essential quality of a successful *ekphrasis* was 'vividness': *evidentia* or *illustratio* in Latin, *enargeia* (ἐνάργεια) in Greek.[64] This quality was meant to help the audience

[59] Bartsch (1989), Scodel (1997), Webb (1997a) and (2007). Porter (1997) and Worthington (2007) offer examples of rhetoric's influence on a variety of genres.
[60] Webb (2007: 537).
[61] On *progymnasmata*, see Hock (1997), Kennedy (2003).
[62] Webb (2009: 41-42).
[63] Theon *Prog*. 11, Hermog. *Prog.* 10, Aphth. *Prog.* 12. See Goldhill (1997), Webb (2009: 8).
[64] For a recent treatment of *ekphrasis* see Webb (2009), for a study of *ekphrasis* in Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius, see Bartsch (1989).

'see' the event being depicted, as a means of provoking an emotional response.[65] Plutarch, speaking of *enargeia* in the writing of history, claims:

> τῶν ἱστορικῶν κράτιστος ὁ τὴν διήγησιν ὥσπερ γραφὴν πάθεσι καὶ προσώποις εἰδωλοποιήσας.
>
> the most effective historian is he who, through vivid representation of emotions and characters, makes his narrative like a painting[66]

The aims and expectations of enargeia were shared by performances on the ancient dramatic stage, particularly in the messenger speeches of Attic Greek tragedy in which a single speaker recounted key plot elements that occurred offstage.[67] By the time of the Greek novelists, it was these tragic monologues that had become the genre's great showpieces because they afforded actors the opportunity to demonstrate the extent of their histrionic talents. In the courtroom, in the agora, or on the stage, descriptive speeches were not just performances in which an audience watched a speaker, but performances in which the speaker aimed to draw a vivid, emotional verbal picture that could be seen in the audience's mind. Speech alone was not the only method for creating *enargeia*. Manilius claims that pantomime dancers could set before the eyes the very fall of Troy and death of Priam[68], and Libanius tells of the dance providing a sight more pleasant than a painting:

> ποία γὰρ γραφή, τίς λειμὼν ἥδιον ὀρχήσεως καὶ ὀρχηστοῦ θέαμα περιάγουντος εἰς ἄλση τὸν θεατὴν καὶ κατακοιμίζοντος ὑπὸ τοῖς δένδρεσιν ἀγέλας βοῶν, αἰπόλια, ποίμνια καὶ τοὺς νομέας ἱστῶντος ἐπὶ φρουρᾷ τῶν θρεμμάτων τοὺς μὲν σύριγγι χρωμένους, τοὺς δὲ αὐλοῦντας ἄλλον ἐν ἄλλοις ἔργοις;
>
> For what painting, what meadow is a sight more pleasant than pantomime and its dancer, taking the spectator around into groves and lulling him to sleep under the trees, as he evokes herds of cattle,

[65] Walker (1993), Webb (2009: 87-106).
[66] Plutarch, *De glor. Ath*. 347A; cf. Walker (1993: 360), Webb (2009: 20).
[67] For studies of tragic messenger speeches see de Jong (1991) and Barrett (2002).
[68] Manilius, *Astronomica* 5.477-485.

> goats, sheep and the shepherds standing guard over the young creatures, some playing the pipe and others the flute, at their various tasks?[69]

Pantomime dancers created absorbing, evocative experiences using the language of the body.

As Shadi Bartsch, Helen Morales and Froma Zeitlin, among others, have shown, descriptions and the visual are key elements of the ancient Greek novels.[70] In Heliodorus, one character specifically entreats his interlocutor to bring his story before his eyes, asking, in effect, for an *ekphrasis*.[71] *Ekphrasis* and *enargeia* are important concepts in regard to the novels. The novelists were probably familiar with rhetorical training, which would be in keeping with the apparent high level of their education. Chariton claims to be the clerk of a rhetor, which suggest he would have had at the very least a sound understanding of rhetoric.[72] These rhetorical tools could be used to influence an audience and bring scenes from the novels before the readers' eyes. But of course an *ekphrasis* on its own is not theatrical. Rather, it is the situations described in the *ekphrasis* and the language in which it is written that create theatrical matter. The novelists use *ekphrasis* as a tool to create theatricality. The consumption of *ekphraseis* may have helped an ancient reader visualise a scene, and, like Dio, 'stage' a performance in the mind's eye.

A third rhetorical feature found in the *progymnasmata* is also important for the Greek novel: *ethopoiia* (ἠθοποιία).[73] The term refers to the 'imitation of the character of the person in question', in other words, the portrayal of a specific

[69] Libanius, *Or.* 64.116. For a study of Libanius *Or.* 64 see Molloy (1996).
[70] Bühler (1976), Bartsch (1989), Morgan (1992), Winkler (2001), Zeitlin (2003), Morales (2004), Reardon (2005), Montiglio (2012a).
[71] Heliodorus 3.1.1.
[72] Chariton 1.1.1.
[73] Hock (1997: 455).

person that conveys an impression of his or her personality.[74] Ronald Hock explains that the language used in *ethopoiiai* 'should reflect the person's age, gender, social status, role, disposition, and nationality'.[75] It can be divided into three types, according to Aphthonius: ones that depict disposition (ἠθικαί), emotion (παθητικαί), or both (μικταί).[76] The technique, used by both professional and apprentice declaimers in their impersonations of historical figures, involves the creation of a distinct character. The novelists, particularly Heliodorus, need to create characters who speak in distinct voices that reflect their personalities. For example, the character of Cnemon is defined by his apparent interest in drama (as will be discussed in a later chapter). On another level, characters in the novels also employ *ethopoiia*. In Chariton, the slave Plangon assumes the character of her mistress Callirhoe and delivers a speech as Callirhoe would have spoken it, complete with references to Callirhoe's pride in her noble birth and Syracusan heritage.[77] The novelists use *ethopoiia*, along with *ekphrasis* and *enargeia* not only in order to display their erudition and ability to employ sophisticated rhetorical techniques. They rather use these techniques for the same reason a declaimer or playwright would, to capture the imagination of their audience and enhance their experience of the words they read or heard.

The writer may use a variety of techniques to shape a reader's response. From that point onward it is up to the reader to direct his own imaginative response, taking the written word as the inspiration, not the limit, for his imagination. A writer would be hard pressed to illustrate everything, and as Quintilian and Dionysius of Halicarnassus expect, a reader can supplement a

[74] Hermog., *Prog.* 9.
[75] Theon, *Prog.* 8; cf. Hock (1997: 457).
[76] Apth., *Prog.* 11, Hermog., *Prog.* 9.
[77] Chariton 3.1.6-8.

description with added details. Writing on visual imaging as reader response, Ellen Esrock explains:

> To eliminate these indeterminacies, the reader 'fills out,'—that is, the reader draws upon her own experiences to complete the fictional representation…[78]

A reader's life, his experiences—educational, cultural, public, private—provide fodder for his imagination.[79] This imaginative supplementation would have been an important aspect of the experience of reading a Greek novel. A reader would be invited, even expected, to flesh out a story with his own personal and cultural vocabulary. This vocabulary would come from a variety of cultural contexts or 'languages' with which a reader was familiar, and which a reader could bring to bear on a text.[80] Different languages/frames of reference could be 'flipped into prominence' when a reader encounters something in a text that recalls, for him, one of these languages.[81]

The performative dimension latent in the novels is one such cultural context waiting to be called to the surface by the conscious mental actions of the reader. Contemporary performance culture provides an 'intertext' for the novels for those readers who choose to bring their experience of the stage to their reading of the texts. Just as tragedy is not a 'required' intertext for viewing the mythological paintings on Southern Italian vases, and yet a familiarity with performance could 'enrich'[82] a viewer's experience, so too can experience of performance culture, in any and all of its forms, enhance and 'enrich' a reading of a Greek novel. The Hellenistic and Imperial periods were saturated with

[78] Esrock (1994: 25).
[79] Esrock (1994: 25).
[80] Jauss and Benzinger (1970), Bakhtin (1971), Kristeva (1974).
[81] Fowler (1997: 19), Lada-Richards (2009a: 120). For an overview of intertextuality see Allen (2011).
[82] A term I use as in Taplin (2007) and similarly to Harrison (2007).

performance genres that have not survived in written form, many of which never required a permanent written text or script. Although mostly absent (aside from papyrus finds, inscriptions and anecdotal evidence) from the written record, this 'subliterary' performance culture was vibrant and widely spread. It is in the Hellenistic period that the idea of *theatrum mundi* becomes a common metaphor, and performance genres were an important, even vital, cultural discourse.[83]

The Greek novels are texts and naturally interact with other texts. It would, however, be a blinkered and entirely too narrow approach to assume that, because of their textuality, the novels must have only texts as dialogic partners. The novels were neither conceived in isolation from nor inoculated against subliterary influences at the time of their conception; on the contrary, they must have been able to resonate with readers steeped in a flourishing performance culture. It is not necessary to prove that novelists intended to make specific subliterary references in order to discuss the potential influence performance culture could have had on the novels' readers. The novels would have seemed more meaningful and richer to readers willing and able to activate a connection with live performance culture in their readings. Although they can be read without that connection, they are even more enjoyable for those who care for mime, pantomime and oratorical display. Even if a novelist were not consciously including performance themes, it would have been difficult for an author or a reader to remain completely aloof and ignorant of subliterary performance culture and to prevent any subliterary contamination or interference. Live performance was pervasive and, as Edith Hall observes:

[83] Pollitt (1986), Chaniotis (1997), Edwards (2002). Evidence of the theatrical metaphor is found as far back as the fifth century BCE, with Democritus (68 B 115 DK): 'The world is a stage, life is a stage entrance; you came, you saw, you went away' (ὁ κόσμος σκηνή, ὁ βίος πάροδος· ἦλθες, εἶδες, ἀπῆλθες).

> Theater critics have, moreover, long been aware that there is something distinctive about the immanent presence of live performance on human memory. Far from being an ephemeral art, which happens, comes to an end, and vanishes without a trace, a compelling theatrical experience can leave a much deeper impression on the memory even than the printed word or printed image.[84]

One would need to prove that the novelists were writing in complete isolation in order to claim they were in no way conversant with contemporary performance culture. It is more likely that they, like their readers, were aware of the performances around them.

Performance Culture and the Novel: Theoretical Frameworks

Now that we have discussed definitions of theatricality and ancient theory regarding the interaction between text, imagination and image, we must discuss theoretical frameworks that could serve to illuminate the ways in which the novels and novelists interact with performance genres, or how readers may have interpreted performance genres *within* the novels. I will begin with the first issue, regarding the interplay of genres.

The ancient novels make references to a variety of literary dramatic works. We could refer to these references as allusions or intertextuality. These two terms, according to Stephen Hinds, are distinguished by their emphasis on authorial intention: allusion suggests authorial intent while intertextuality places more meaning with the interpretative processes of the reader.[85] Allusion and intertextuality, despite their differences, both share a connotation regarding what is being referenced—both tend to suggest a physical, literary text.[86] But each text

[84] Hall (2004: 69).
[85] Hinds (1998: 47-8).
[86] For allusion see Hinds (1998), Morales (2000).

carries with it a wealth of cultural discourses with which it is in dialogue.[87] In the case of the novel, all forms of cultural discourse regarding contemporary performance culture could be considered a significant interlocutor.[88]

At times, the way the novel engages with other genres does not fit easily within the confines of a clearly defined allusion or intertext. Plot elements or themes are often reminiscent of more than one genre. It is left to the reader to choose which genres to recognise. When attempting to define these broader engagements, it may be helpful to turn to Stephen Harrison's concept of 'generic enrichment'. Harrison defines the term as:

> the way in which generically identifiable texts gain literary depth and texture from detailed confrontation with, and consequent inclusion of elements from, texts which appear to belong to other literary genres.[89]

Harrison's conception of generic enrichment is broader than the specificity of a quotation or allusion to a text. The concept of 'literary depth and texture' suggests that genres can enliven each other by adding to the reader's stock of associations and assumptions.

Harrison identifies two different repertoires from different genres. The first, the 'formal repertoire', are 'formal or technical features recognizable by readers as associated with a distinct literary genre'.[90] An example of this 'formal repertoire' in the Greek novel could be trial scenes, which clearly borrow technical features from forensic oratory. The second is 'thematic repertoire', 'thematic features recognizable by readers as associated with a distinct literary

[87] Kristeva (1974: 338-339), Lada-Richards (1999: 16).
[88] It is also possible to think about 'intratextuality' in the novel, and the ways one part of a text interacts with another part of the same. See Sharrock and Morales (2000).
[89] Harrison (2007: 1).
[90] Harrison (2007: 22).

genre.'[91] In the Greek novel, a 'thematic' feature from another genre could be Heliodorus' engagement with the *Odyssey*. Harrison flags one more term worth keeping in mind. He defines 'metageneric signals' as 'direct statements recognizable by readers which specifically raise the issue of which literary kind(s) a text might belong to'.[92] The references to drama in the novels raise this very sort of question.

These terms are useful for reading genre-shifting in the novels. Daniel Selden suggests similar ideas about genre, in direct reference to the novel. He describes the overlapping of genres in a text as 'syllepsis', in the sense that a text can be read in more than one category of social construction.[93] As John Morgan points out, Selden's conception is very similar to Mikhail Bakhtin's 'dialogism'.[94] Bakhtin emphasises the ubiquity of dialogue in every level of expression—even the 'self' is dialogic, existing in relation to others.[95] Michael Holquist explains that at a basic level, dialogism is the name for 'a necessary *multiplicity* in human perception'.[96] Cultural expression is constantly in reference or response to previous statements, as well as in anticipation of future statements.

Harrison's generic enrichment also appears to be indebted to Bakhtin's dialogism and the accompanying concepts of 'heteroglossia' and 'polyphony'. 'Polyphony' refers to the quality of having multiple voices, all of which are equally valid.[97] Holquist claims that 'heteroglossia'

[91] Harrison (2007: 22).
[92] Harrison (2007: 22).
[93] Selden (1994: 51).
[94] Morgan (1996b: 66). 'Dialogism', however, was a term never used by Bakhtin himself, Holquist (1990: 15).
[95] Holquist (1990: 19).
[96] Holquist (1990: 22), the author's italics.
[97] Dentith (1995: 42-48).

> is a way of conceiving the world as made up of a roiling mass of languages, each of which has its own distinct formal markers.[98]

Language is subjective, and a single word could have different meanings to members of different social, educational or geographical groups.[99] Cultural discourses are saturated with heteroglossia, with words and concepts with multiple meanings and contexts. The theme of adultery, which occurs in all three novels, can relate to a number of contexts outside the novel, ranging from forensic oratory to Classical tragedy to contemporary mime.[100]

One of the strengths of Harrison's definitions is his emphasis on repertoire and metageneric signals as features a reader can recognise. It takes away from the issue of authorial intention, leaning instead on reader response. Reader response criticism is another useful tool for interrogating the Greek novel and performance culture. Hans Robert Jauss and Elizabeth Benzinger discuss

> the possibility that the reader of a new work has to perceive it not only within the narrow horizon of his literary expectations but also within the wider horizon of his experience of life.[101]

The horizon of expectations is not only confined to the knowledge of other literature but to life experience. This is particularly important to keep in mind when dealing with performance culture, which deals very much with ancient life experiences as opposed to literary texts. This 'experience of life' also comes close to Kristeva's conception that intertextuality involves not just texts in relation to texts, but also to the cultural discourses at play in and around the texts.[102] Life experience is an example of what a reader brings to a text and life

[98] Holquist (1990: 69), Dentith (1995: 35).
[99] For example, the differences between the American and English definitions of 'boot', 'vest', 'jumper'.
[100] For example, see Porter (1997) and (2003), Kapparis (2000).
[101] Jauss and Benzinger (1970: 14).
[102] Kristeva (1974: 339).

experience involves an immersion in a variety of cultural codes and discourses.[103]

Dickens as a Model

Niklas Holzberg suggests that Callirhoe and the other ideal Greek novels may have played a 'substitutive' role for theatre in their own cultural context.[104] His comment implies that novel readers were not part of the audiences flocking to contemporary performances. Considering the ubiquity of performance, perhaps it would be better to suggest that the novels were not a 'substitute' for theatre as much as they were an alternative or additional form of entertainment, appealing to some of the same audience that filled the theatres. A more recent author whose work seems to share a similar relationship with the performance culture of his time period is Charles Dickens.

Theatre in London was to be found on the streets.[105] Jesters, tight-rope dancers, street reciters and stilt-vaulters performed on the thoroughfares, similar to ancient street performances. Dickens, in parallel with the Greek novelists, does not draw from a single dramatic genre. Rather

> he drew freely on the rich variety of popular entertainments that had always inspired, causing him to mix and juxtapose a panoply of voices—to create the dynamic interplay that constituted his fictional realm.[106]

Dickens' novels are polyphonic and heteroglossic.[107] He uses signs from a variety of genres and discourses to enrich his novels, adding the 'depth' and

[103] Konstan (2009: 5).
[104] Holzberg (1995: 33).
[105] Beer (1977: 171).
[106] Mackay (1989: 8).
[107] Dentith (1995: 45, 196).

'texture' described by Harrison.[108] In addition, his use of contemporary theatre could be recognised by a theatre-going reader.

Joseph Litvak observes

> the 'Dickens theatre' must seem rather unpromisingly—that is, unproblematically—up-front; no one should have any trouble finding it. The difficulty, for us at any rate, lies in finding something to say about it.[109]

On one hand, the theatricality of Dickens' novels is obvious. And yet, as discussed above, it is not always enlightening to call a novel 'theatrical'. It requires more than a surface acknowledgement of something theatrical to begin to understand Dickens' engagement with contemporary drama. Dickens himself, in a speech to the Royal General Theatrical Fund, claimed 'Every writer of fiction, though he may not adopt the dramatic form, writes in effect for the stage'.[110] Dickens shows an awareness not only of theatrical influences but also of the conception of a novelist as a dramatist, in suggesting that writers of fiction are like playwrights. His engagement with and interest in theatre were overt—he performed in and heavily influenced Wilkie Collins' play *The Frozen Deep* and also participated in a variety of amateur theatricals. He was famous for his energetic public readings from his novels—performing his prose. Not only were his works performed by their author, but also numerous versions of his works were performed as plays without the author's permission. [111] The interpenetrability of genres is well expressed by the Victorian consumption of 'Dickens'—in print, in person, on the stage, in song and in artwork.[112] As I will

[108] Harrison (2007: 1).
[109] Litvak (1992: 110).
[110] Dickens (1960: 262).
[111] Schlicke (1985: 33).
[112] Schlicke (1985: 33).

show in the following chapter, it is possible that ancient Greek novels had a similar life within cultural discourse.

The similarities between ancient and Victorian performance culture aside, Dickens is a useful model for understanding of how the tools of theatre can enliven a written text. Gillian Beer claims,

> More than any other Victorian novelist, Dickens draws upon the theatre's power of *manifestation* in his subject matter, characterisation and in the activities of his style. His style is spectacle.[113]

Beer's use of 'manifestation' seems to hint at something similar to enargeia. While on the stage characters appear in the flesh in plausible situations, Dickens is able to create living, breathing characters on the page that seem to 'manifest' themselves, to embody a character in the same way that a living actor does. Once more the similarities are clear in the moments when he chooses to employ theatricality, particularly for conveying emotional content.[114] Dickens uses his readers' familiarity with the theatre to both create vividness and elicit emotional responses. Like the Greek novelists, he did not rely on a single performance genre for inspiration and his work suggests a familiarity with contemporary performance culture (which in Dickens' case, we know is true). As did Dickens, the novelists could have shared an audience with stage performers and perhaps even have competed for the attention of that audience.

Overview

This thesis is, to my knowledge, the only extended treatment of subliterary performance in the Greek novel and adds necessary depth to previous

[113] Beer (1977: 179).
[114] Carr (1989: 31).

forays into the subject. In order to paint a picture of the contemporary performance context, I begin with a chapter that lays out the types and genres of performances in existence during the centuries over which the novels were written. This chapter illustrates the performance culture that a participant in city life would have been aware of or could have participated in. The performance overview will be followed by a discussion of two general levels of theatricality in the novels. Chapter two explores the novelists' possible interaction with literary and dramatic theory, potential commentary on the poetics/aesthetics of the novel genre, and the characterisation of the novel author. In the third chapter, I turn to the novels' dynamics between performers, deliberate and unintentional, their audiences within the novel, and the reader as an external audience. Chapters four and five focus on two of the novels' female protagonists, Chariclea and Leucippe. I will discuss their roles as willing and unwilling performers in performances both of their own making and constructed by others. Both women find themselves in situations where they become 'actresses' in scenes reminiscent not just of tragedy or comedy, but of mime, pantomime, tragic burlesque and declamation. In chapter six, I lay out an argument for how the adultery mime underlies the suitors' plot in Chariton and how Achilles Tatius weaves adultery mime and other subliterary genres into *Leucippe and Clitophon*'s complicated love quadrangle. Chapter seven examines Cnemon's tale in Heliodorus and its relationship with adultery mime and declamation shed light on the character of Cnemon and on the novel's version of Athens. I conclude with a chapter highlighting new suggestions for subliterary interference in the novels, including an argument for mime influence in the character arc of Chariton's Theron. In addition, I suggest several new aspects of pantomime in

Achilles Tatius, as well as a unique approach to his novel's relationship with P.Berol inv. 13927.

1. Performance Overview

Introduction

So much written about the ancient novel has focussed on the way in which authors interact with the textual tradition. This approach has many merits and it is likely that a significant proportion of novel readers did appreciate a novel's engagement with an older literary tradition. As studies of intertextuality have suggested, part of the enjoyment of a text could have been the act of recognising the layers of intertextual interaction within a passage, scene, or a single line. Such intertextual approaches are interesting and fruitful, but often they neglect to acknowledge the non-textual *Nachleben* of written works that falls outside of the strictly literary tradition but within the cultural context of classical literature—specifically their life on the stage in later centuries. Mythological and tragic characters, archetypes and plotlines were disseminated by a variety of media, written, oral and visual. By the time of the novelist the name of a famous tragic character, like Medea, would have meant more than the 'text' of Euripides' *Medea*, but also the visual text of vase paintings, the bodily text of the pantomime dancer, the mythological raw material for the declaimer and even, perhaps, the fodder for parody. Augustine observes that the subject of Jupiter committing adultery is found in a variety of mediums—painting, sculpture, writing, reading, acting, singing and dancing.[115] Contemporary performance was one of the potential pathways for understanding a tragic or mythological subject. In the first centuries CE, the works of Euripides, Menander and other authors were part of a lively performance context.[116] Texts were re-

[115] Augustine, *Ep.* 91.5, *Tot locis pingitur, funditur, tunditur, sculpitur, scribitur, legitur, agitur, cantatur, saltatur Iuppiter adulteria tanta committens.*
[116] Jones (1991) and (1993), Easterling and Miles (1999), Hall (2002), Csapo (2010).

adapted and re-appropriated into a variety of performance genres such as the wildly popular mime and pantomime.

Before exploring this previously neglected aspect in reference to the novels, it is necessary to illustrate the performance milieu of the period in which the novels were written. Although the evidence for post-classical performance culture is more opaque than we could wish, we do know that it was vibrant and varied, ranging from humble street performances to elaborate staged spectacles. Subject matter could consist of anything from the scatological to the philosophical, and as the subject matter suggests, performances encompassed élite and popular culture, as well as everything in between. With such a variety available for consumption, there was certainly competition for audience attention. It is possible that novel authors considered themselves participants within this performance culture context, not only as audience members but also as entertainers themselves, competing for the attention of the same audiences as writers for and performers on the stage. This kind of cross-genre competition is an established fact of imperial performance life. Apuleius, for one, knows full well that he shares the Carthaginian stage with his sub-literary rivals, mimes, rope-dancers, pantomimes, as well as tragic and comic actors.[117] The novels, like contemporary performances, serve to entertain, and do so using a combination of broad humour, salacious situations and references to tragedy and epic. The content could have appealed to the tastes of readers who enjoyed the variety of performances on offer on the ancient stage. The similarity in content suggests that the stage can provide one of the many possible pathways into these texts.

[117] Apuleius, *Flor.* 18.4.

It is notoriously challenging to produce a comprehensive survey of ancient performance culture because the evidence 'comes in disparate clumps unevenly spread across time and different media'.[118] As such, it is difficult to pinpoint many, if any, time-specific performance trends, but the widespread evidence suggests that theatrical entertainment experienced little change during the first several centuries CE, in which case a synchronic approach to the evidence is not out of place.[119] This span of time and locale makes specificity difficult. There are a number of particular complications when it comes to illustrating the aspects of performance culture most relevant to the ancient Greek novels. First of all, there is the question of geographical location—the novels are each set in a different variety of locales, and to the best of our knowledge the novelists themselves seem to have come from across the Greek and Roman world. Our lack of certain biographical knowledge about the novel authors, such as where they spent their lives or whether they travelled, prevents us from any clearer view about what kinds of performances they may have encountered in their lifetimes. Chariton claims to reside in Aphrodisias and Heliodorus professes to be from Emesa, so if we take them at their word, they hail from the Greek East.[120] Achilles Tatius does not offer a place of origin, though some scholars have suggested that he was from Alexandria as alleged by an entry in the Suda and several manuscripts, and perhaps supported by the glowing description of the city in book five.[121] Performance culture would not have been uniform across regions, yet it is impossible to place any certain limits on the kinds of

[118] Csapo (2010: 188).
[119] Webb (2008: 11). Webb's focus, of course, is on later antiquity. She claims 'as far as it is possible to tell, a second century observer would probably have found much that was familiar in a sixth century pantomime or mime.'
[120] Chariton 1.1.1, Heliodorus 10.41.4.
[121] Vilborg (1955: 1) lists the MSS that include this information. See also Gaselee (1969: x), Plepelits (1980: 1), Winkler (1989: 170), Morales (2004: 4), Whitmarsh (2011: 74-75).

performances with which the novelists and their readers may have been acquainted. In addition to the geographical span we must also acknowledge the span of centuries—Chariton most likely wrote in the first century and Heliodorus in the third. It is likely that this time span saw the rise and fall in popularity of a variety of performance modes, aesthetic trends and popular performers and performance genres. So it is with broad strokes that we must sketch our impressions of their performance culture context. In my analysis, I intend to focus on possibilities instead of impossibilities, allowing for a wide range of performance genres to have been accessible to not just the novelists, but also their readers.[122]

The High/Low Culture Divide

Ancient performers provided entertainment for all levels of society and education. Many performance genres could span class divides, acting as 'cultural amphibians'[123] equally comfortable on the streets and in the slums or in the theatre or the homes of the wealthy. Modern value judgments have placed scholarly emphasis on the forms of entertainment that reveal the highest level of education in its producers and consumers. The performances, it is assumed, were primarily for the élite, who could understand and appreciate the *paideia* on display. Although perhaps only a small, highly educated group would be capable of understanding the whole of a performance (of tragedy, of poetry) on an

[122] I will take a synchronic approach in my brief overview of several performance genres, but will try to avoid using too much evidence from later periods to illuminate my discussions of Chariton's interaction with performance culture. However, though Chariton could not have been aware of any performance innovations from the future, Achilles Tatius or Heliodorus could have been aware of the performance elements from the past, so evidence from earlier periods do play a role in my discussion of the later authors.

[123] To borrow a phrase from Lada-Richards (2007: 23).

academic level, performers entertained with not only the scholarly content of their pieces, for example the ability to stir up the audience's emotions.

The other side of the coin, subliterary performance, is confronted by a mirror set of biases. The implication is that the educated élite were too cultured to choose to use subliterary references to engage with an equally educated audience.[124] It is the equivalent of assuming that I, as a PhD candidate, could not possibly have any interest in reality television programming because at no point would my intellect be challenged, that I would find no allusions at which to nod knowingly. Although I may prefer to advertise my admiration for University Challenge rather than my interest in the Eurovision song contest (a modern agonistic festival?), I am able to enjoy both. When it comes to pathways of influence and the ancient novels, it is important to take into account all kinds of performance genres, not simply those labeled 'élite' that allow us to once again point back to Classical tragedy as the sole important source of dramatic material. It is dangerous to privilege 'high culture' performance over other genres and to fail to acknowledge the multiple, diverse paths that carry the same stories, plotlines and themes—pathways of influence that diverge and converge.

Tragedy

Another live performance context attractive to an élite audience is the tragic tradition. From 387/386 BCE, the tragedies of the three fifth century masters, Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides, were revived, re-performed and

[124] Andreassi (1997: 20) implies that Latin novel author Apuleius uses 'low' literature to engage with 'new "cultural customers", having – maybe – a lower cultural capacity compared with that of traditional readers and intellectuals.' See also Fusillo (1994). Lada-Richards (2008) well articulates the ancient tension between élite denunciation and appropriation of pantomime.

entered into a new contest of 'old plays' at the City Dionysia in Athens.[125] Running in parallel with the staging of new plays, the 'old' plays then had their own designated slot at the yearly festival and tragic actors were responsible for putting on the productions.[126] Individual actors became increasingly well-known, and they began to influence the choice and arrangement of plays. Texts could be rearranged and lines or sections interpolated to suit the talents of an actor or the tastes of an audience.[127] Instead of learning new material for every festival, actors could turn to proven, popular texts and become familiar with material that could be recycled again and again. This change could be considered 'the confirmation of an important trend towards the formation of a repertoire'.[128] Classical tragedy, though clearly respected, was not held to any standard that prevented alterations or excerpts, in the same manner as 17th and 18th century versions of Shakespeare. An actor had the authority to use the material at hand as he saw fit, to chop and change to his own advantage, while also performing a text that was acknowledged as 'tragic', until the late fourth century, when Lycurgus attempted to establish official texts for the three tragedians.[129] Eventually Classical tragedies traveled with actors throughout the Greek world, and before then, they had travelled with authors.[130] The plays, Classical and more recent creations, could be performed at Hellenistic festivals. Programmes for the Soteria festival at Delphi from the third century BCE include tragic actors[131] and festivals in Lycia in the second century also list tragic (and comic) actors.

[125] Hall (2007: 279-281).
[126] $TrGf_1$ (DID A 1 201); Easterling (1997: 199, 213).
[127] Hall (2006: 50-51), Hall (2007: 279-280), Lada-Richards (2007) and (2009a).
[128] Easterling (1997: 213). See also Gentili (1979: 21-22), Taplin (2007: 5-9).
[129] [Plut] *Lives of the ten orators. Lycurgus = Mor.* 841f.
[130] Aeschylus performed for the tyrant Hiero in Syracuse and Euripides performed for the king of Macedon. Easterling (1997), Taplin (2007: 6-7).
[131] These lists also include comic actors and rhapsodes; see Sifakis (1967).

Individual actors could become stars in their own right as they traveled internationally on the festival circuit.[132]

Over the centuries the production of full-scale tragic performances dwindled. There is no extant evidence of tragedy in the form of three actors and a chorus from much later than the early third century in the Greek East. In the Latin West, such performances may have tapered off even earlier.[133] Despite their apparent disappearance from the popular stage, Classical tragedies could still be consumed by the educated élite, who could have had access to tragic extracts or entire texts, which were read privately. Portions could have been read aloud as entertainment in the home either *en famille* or in company, as in the home of Pliny the Younger.[134] In such a way, the plays could be 'performed' for private consumption.

The term 'tragedy' remained part of performance culture, although the types of performances associated with the term evolved, as did the ways in which tragic texts and plots were consumed, onstage and off. Aristotle refers to compilations of *rheseis* in the *Poetics*.[135] There are several extant compilations of dramatic extracts from the third and second centuries BCE, which include a version of Euripides' *Hippolytus* without the choral parts and an anthology of lyric odes.[136] Bruno Gentili intriguingly suggests that documentary evidence supports the claim that anthologies were not just school texts but were also part of theatrical companies' repertory.[137] At any rate, these excerpts suggest that

[132] Sifakis (1967: 72-73), Csapo and Slater (1995: 186-206, esp. 189), Easterling (1997).
[133] Easterling and Miles (1999: 96).
[134] Pliny the Younger 1.15.2, 3.1.9, 9.36.4, 9.17.3, Pliny the Elder 3.5.12; Parker (2009), Johnson (2010). A more recent similar entertainment would be the Georgian (and later) practice of reading novels and plays aloud at home, as recounted in Jane Austen's novels and letters.
[135] Aristotle, *Poetics* 1456a30.
[136] P.Sorb inv. 2252, c250 BCE, Pack^2 393 and P.Strauss W.G. 304-307, Pack^2 426. Cf. Gentili (1979: 19).
[137] Gentili (1979: 21-22).

tragedies were no longer necessarily consumed as whole texts, but that discrete sections could be appreciated alone, out of their original context.

Even though full-scale reproductions of entire plays become increasingly rare, a performance tradition involving the themes, words and music associated with tragedy continued. Singing was an essential aspect of the original performances of Classical tragedies and this aspect became emphasised in later centuries.[138] Professional travelling tragic solo actors, called *tragoidoi*, sung portions of tragedies while wearing the costume associated with classical tragedy—high-soled shoes and buskins. Tragic soloists could become famous, wealthy and influential. They would perform a selection of the best excerpts of tragedies in solo performances, which Hall likens to modern concerts or recitals.[139] The Leiden papyrus inv. 510 rearranges the order of sections of *Iphigenia in Aulis* and Oslo papyrus inv. 1413 contains two tragic passages that appear to reference episodes regarding Pyrrhus Neoptolemus.[140] As the selections show, texts could not only be rearranged, but portions of one text could be added to or performed along with another text. The accompanying music may not have been the original 'score', though perhaps the singers used music that sounded 'old'.[141] Later soloists sung portions that would have been spoken by actors in Classical performance.[142] A performer named Ailios Themison set selections from Euripides, Sophocles and Timotheus to his own music.[143] As this selection suggests, new and 'old' tragedy could be combined,

[138] Hall (2002: 18-24).
[139] Hall (2002: 13).
[140] Gentili (1979: 30).
[141] Hall (2002: 18).
[142] Gentili (1979: 28), Hall (2002: 15-18).
[143] Hall (2002: 15).

old versions performed along with new, in this case set to original music—and still be considered 'tragic'.

Latin tragedy appears to have experienced the same kinds of transformations as Greek. Senecan tragedy was probably performed, though perhaps only in private theatricals.[144] In addition to Latin adaptations of Greek tragedy and original Latin tragedy, there appear to have been similar solo sung tragic performances, such as those performed by Nero. Nero may have experimented with a variety of 'tragic' genres, including pantomime (*tragoedia saltata*), tragic singing (*tragoedia cantata*) and tragic arias sung to the cithara (*citharoedia*).[145] The difficulty in identifying Nero's performance genres lies with vocabulary. Although our modern terms distinguish tragic acting from singing or dancing, the distinctions were less clear in antiquity.[146] The concept of 'tragedy' and the 'tragic' was malleable. The plots and themes of 'tragedy' could be experienced on the page, in a full-scale reproduction of a Classical tragedy, by tragic arias and by other performance genres that also turned to the emotionally resonant stories associated with Classical tragedy. These other genres also aimed to display intense emotional situations and provoke emotional responses from their audiences. 'Tragedy' was experienced through a variety of genres, all pathways of influence.

Pantomime

Tragic themes were disseminated through a variety of live performance genres, reaching a wide audience and allowing tragic texts a rich and varied

[144] Easterling (1997: 220-221), Zimmermann (2008) and Zanobi (2008) both argue for cross fertilization between Seneca's plays and pantomime.
[145] Lesky (1966), Kelly (1979), Easterling (1997: 220-221), Hall (2002: 26-27).
[146] Easterling (1997: 220-221).

Nachleben. The stories of tragedy were perpetuated in the mythological stories related by the incredibly popular pantomime genre.[147] Pantomime performers wore masks, perhaps masks with closed mouths, as they did not speak or sing, but rather silently danced or otherwise enacted stories, usually from myth or tragedy.[148] Plutarch describes two forms of pantomime, the Pyladic and the Bathyllic. The names come from two famous pantomime performers, Pylades and Bathyllos, who embodied the two different styles.[149] He explains that the Pyladic is 'puffed-up and emotional and with many characters' (ὀγκώδη καὶ παθητικὴν καὶ πολυπρόσωπον), and the Bathyllic 'is a straightforward dance, approaching the *kordax*, and presents a dance about Echo or some Pan or Satyr revelling with Eros' (αὐτόθεν πέζαν τοῦ κόρδακος ἁπτομένην, Ἠχοῦς ἤ τινος Πανὸς ἢ Σατύρου σὺν Ἔρωτι κωμάζοντος ὑπόρχημά τι διατιθεμένην).[150] In many ways, pantomime could be considered the heir of tragedy, and it was sometimes referred to as 'rhythmic tragic dancing'.[151] The implication of a tragic ancestry gives pantomime a veneer of nobility, respectability and a share in high culture. Suetonius does not appear to distinguish pantomime from tragedy:

> *pantomimus Mnester tragoediam saltauit, quam olim Neoptolemus tragoedus ludis, quibus rex Macedonum Philippus occisus est, egerat*
>
> The pantomime Mnester danced a tragedy, which the tragic actor Neoptolemus had once performed at the games at which King Philip of Macedon was killed.[152]

Five out of the six dances listed on an inscription to P. Apolaustos Memphios share their titles with plays by Euripides: *Orestes, Troades, Herakles, Bacchae*

[147] Hall (2013c).
[148] Robert (1930), Bonaria (1959: 231-233, 237-239), Jory (1981: esp. 148-151), Jory (1984), Jory (1996: 4-5).
[149] Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 20d.
[150] Plutarch, *Convivial Questions* 711f.
[151] *FD* III.1, 551; *FD* III.2, 105; *I.Ephesus* II.71; *SEG* 1.529. Athenaeus in *Deipnosophistae* 20d refers to pantomime as ὄρχησις τραγική. See also Lada-Richards (2007: 33), Hall (2008a: 4).
[152] Suetonius, *Gaius/Calig*. 57.9.

and *Hippolytus*.[153] Like tragedy, pantomime could embody mythological stories with great emotional weight. It appears to be this type of pantomime that Plutarch calls 'puffed up', as if it harboured pretensions above its cultural worth. Sure enough, pantomime's relationship with tragedy and 'high culture' seems to have been fraught.

Lucian, in over-the-top fashion, declares that pantomime provided a thorough education in myth and tragedy.[154] In a more measured manner, Libanius claims that the tragic poets had served as 'universal teachers for the people' (κοινοὶ διδάσκαλοι τοῖς δήμοις), and after their heyday only the wealthy had access to that kind of education until the pantomime arrived 'as a form of instruction for the masses in the deeds of the ancients' (διδαχήν τινα τοῖς πλήθεσι παλαιῶν πράξεων). He suggests that thanks to pantomime 'now a goldsmith will converse not badly with someone from the schools about the houses of Priam and Laius' (νῦν ὁ χρυσοχόος πρὸς τὸν ἐκ τῶν διδασκαλείων οὐ κακῶς διαλέξεται περὶ τῆς οἰκίας Πριάμου καὶ Λαΐου).[155] Libanius contends that pantomime has taken over from tragedy the mantle of educator of the masses, providing a sort of 'who's who' of mythology that would allow a pantomime aficionado to be able to discuss mythological and tragic topics with someone who had received an élite education. Procopius calls pantomimes 'tragedy teachers' (τραγῳδοδιδάσκαλοι), but does so with disdain, claiming he does not want to be associated with their like.[156] Pantomime, in both praise and censure, finds itself situated in both high culture and in popular culture. Blake Leyerle takes Libanius' statements as evidence that 'the theatre served as a primary vehicle for the inculcation of

[153] *CIL* 14.4254; Bonaria (1959: 229-230), Webb (2008: 63).
[154] Lucian, *De Salt.* 37-61.
[155] Libanius, *Or*. 64.112. Similar opinions are found in Libanius, *Or*. 62.8 and *Or*. 2.30.
[156] Procopius, *Secret History* 1.4.

classical culture'.[157] Perhaps it is better to say that theatre, in particular pantomime with its often tragic themes, was an important vehicle for the dissemination of classical culture, and one that was characterised as such in antiquity.

Not all pantomime performances would fall under the category of 'high culture'. Dio Chrysostom claims that some pantomime dancers performed in the streets, ignoring the distractions of street vendors and street fights.[158] Pantomime could be performed in public theatres, or at the fringes of society. By the end of the second century CE, pantomimes were officially part of agonistic festivals, though it is likely that they were part of the festivals' unofficial entertainments much earlier.[159] Alongside the 'educational' mythological elements of pantomime were the spectacular and the sensual aspects of the performance. Pantomime could be highly erotic and transgressive.[160] The dancers could inflame the viewer. Minucius Felix explains that a dancer 'while he feigns love, he inflicts the wounds of love' (*amorem dum fingit, infligit*).[161] First of all there was the pantomime dancer's gender-bending body, capable of fluid imitation of male and female. Columella decries the femininity of the male dancer:

> *attonitique miramur gestus effeminatorum, quod a natura sexum viris denegatum muliebri motu mentiantur decipiantque oculos spectantium*
>
> As if thunderstruck, we are lost in admiration of the gestures of effeminate men, the reason being that with their womanish motion they feign the gender denied to men by nature and deceive the eyes of the viewers.[162]

[157] Leyerle (2001: 18).
[158] Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 20.9; Hall (2008: 6).
[159] Lightfoot (2002: 212).
[160] Lada-Richards (2007: 64-78).
[161] Minucius Felix, *Octavius* 37.12.
[162] Columella, *On Agriculture* 1.15.

The erotic movements of a dancer's body was compounded with the subject matter: romantic or emotionally charged stories. Cyprian claims:

> *exprimunt inpudicam Venerem, adulterum Martem, louem illum suum non magis regno quam vitiis principem, in terrenos amores cum ipsis suis fulminibus ardentem, nunc in plumam oloris albescere, nunc aureo imbre defluere, nunc in puerorum pubescentium raptus ministris avibus prosilire.*
>
> They portray the shameless Venus, the adulterous Mars, and Jupiter himself—excelling more by his vices than by his reign—burning in earthly love affairs together with his thunderbolts, now turning white in the feathers of a swan, now flowing down in a gold rain, now leaping forth to snatch pubescent boys with the aid of birds.[163]

As with the ancient novels, there were love stories with Classical and mythological antecedents or echoes, combined with erotic elements.

Pantomime artists relied on the language of hand movements and speaking with their bodies. Lucian claims Lesbonax of Mytilene called pantomime dancers 'handiwise' (χειρισόφους), while Demetrius the Cynic told a dancer 'your hands themselves seem to speak to me' (μοι δοκεῖς ταῖς χερσὶν αὐταῖς λαλεῖν).[164] Cassiodorus claims pantomimes build pictures with their hands as if they were using letters of the alphabet.[165] They also used part of their costume, a mantle called a *pallium*, to assist them in creating effects. Fronto describes the pantomime dancer's versatility:

> *Ut histriones, quom palliolatim saltant caudam cycni, capillum Veneris, Furiae flagellum, eodem pallio demonstrant…*
>
> as actors, when they dance wearing their mantles, represent a swan's tail, the tresses of Venus, a Fury's scourge, with one and the same mantle…[166]

[163] Cyprian, *To Donatus* 8.
[164] Lucian, *De Salt.* 69, 63. Lada-Richards (2007) and (2013: 123-4, 137 n 102), Webb (2008: 72-77).
[165] Cassiodorus, *Var*. 4.51.9.
[166] Fronto, *On Orations* 5 (p. 111 van den Hout[2])

The gestures of the dancer would be familiar to and easily intelligible by frequent audience members.[167]

The dancers were accompanied by one or more musicians, and could also be accompanied by a solo singer or a chorus singing the events of the story the pantomime danced. Pantomimes could dance solo, with assistants, or in larger groups. As with mime, it seems that pantomime could be as simple or elaborate as the occasion required. Plutarch recommends Bathyllic dancing for dinner party entertainment. A private room like a *triclinium* would only be able to accommodate a small number of dancers. On the other side of the spectrum would be the description of a pantomime performance of the judgment of Paris in Apuleius' novel *The Golden Ass*, which features an elaborate stage decoration of Mount Ida, complete with fountains. The cast includes three dancers impersonating Hera, Aphrodite and Athena as well as three groups of children portraying the Hours, Cupids and the Dioscouri.[168]

Sophists

As Ewen Bowie, Simon Goldhill, Tim Whitmarsh and many others have discussed, during the Imperial period a Greek rhetorical and literary education carried a significant amount of social and political cachet.[169] To be successful in public life, one would do well to be *pepaideumenos*—cultured, educated, sophisticated. Among the most important skills an ambitious individual would need to learn was the art of rhetoric, the ability to craft persuasive arguments.

[167] Webb (2008: 75).
[168] Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* 10.30-32. See May (2006) and (2008) for further treatment of this scene.
[169] For further discussion of the importance of education, or *paideia*, in the Imperial period see Bowersock (1969), Bowie (1970), Gleason (1995), Schmitz (1997), Whitmarsh (2005), Goldhill (2001), (2002) and (2009), Anderson (2003), Borg (2004), Eshleman (2012), among others.

Students learned from rhetorical handbooks, or *progymnasmata*, and practiced writing speeches for hypothetical situations.[170] Hand in hand with the craft of writing speeches was the craft of delivering them successfully: oratory. The best of best among the *pepaideumenoi* were those who delivered speeches as public entertainment—professional declaimers, often called sophists.[171] These sophists, who presented themselves as widely read and well-informed individuals, made their living as paid instructors of rhetoric and made their reputations through compelling demonstrations of their oratorical prowess, sometimes travelling far and wide.[172]

Their speeches could be prepared in advance, or, in a demonstration of intellectual and improvisational mastery, delivered *ex tempore* on a topic of the audience's choosing.[173] Often a sophist would begin his performance with a shorter, entertaining piece praising the city in which he performed or praising his audience. He could also provide a description of a work of art or another sophisticated set-piece.[174] This would be followed by the main event, the longer improvised or pre-prepared speech. Such speeches could cover hypothetical points of law in fictional scenarios, or could be a popular form in which the speaker gave a speech in character as a famous figure from literature or myth, or delivered a speech addressed to a famous figure.[175] Such speeches could capture the attention and admiration of an educated audience that could appreciate that

[170] Russell (1983), Hock (1997), Kennedy (2003), Anderson (1993: 47-53), Webb (2007).
[171] For a discussion of the difference between a sophist and a rhetor, see Bowersock (1969: 12-14).
[172] Bornecque (1902), Bowersock (1969), Russell (1983), Gleason (1995), Gunderson (2000), Anderson (1993: 16), Whitmarsh (2005), Eshleman (2012).
[173] Phil. *VS* 571-2; Anderson (1993: 71), Whitmarsh (2005: 28-29).
[174] Dio *Or*. 1 and 13, Luc. *Herod*. 1f and 4ff; Anderson (2003: 53-55).
[175] Aristides, *Or*. 16 takes inspiration from *Iliad* book 9. Fronto, *Ep. graec*. 8 (pp. 205-5 Van den Hout[2]) replies to Lysias' speech in Plato's *Phaedrus*. Libanius, *Ethopoiiae* 3 and 15 impersonates Achilles making speeches over the body of Patroclus and about the loss of Briseis. See Russell (1983: 1-20, 106-128), Anderson (1993: 55-64), Whitmarsh (2005: 20).

speech writing and especially improvising speeches required not only a quick mind but also a wide range and depth of historical, mythological and literary knowledge.[176] The audience of a sophistic performance served as 'arbiter of a suspenseful process', acting as judges who in part determined the extent of a sophist's success, praising or condemning the performance.[177] Would a sophist pull off his speech? Would the audience approve? An audience of *pepaideumenoi theatai* could be highly attentive not only to factual, grammatical or vocabulary errors, but also to the orator's general skill in delivery.[178] The relationship between audience and performer was reciprocal—an audience could influence a performer and a performer could influence an audience.[179] The interplay between audience and performer is not unique to declamations, but was, as we shall see, a feature of performance culture in the period.[180]

Along with the knowledge of language, myth, history and literature, a successful declaimer needed to be an effective public speaker. The impersonation of historical and mythological figures required the ability to play a part—to portray someone other than oneself. Sophists used the rhetorical tool of *ethopoiia* to build a character and create a dramatic performance.[181] They could employ flamboyant gestures and vocal techniques, using their hands, voices and the rest of the body to convey emotion and meaning.[182] Sophists could even dress strategically to call attention to themselves.[183] Their self-consciousness about self-presentation shows how they resembled actors on the stage. Truly, 'imperial

[176] Schmitz (1997: 156-159), Russell (1983), Anderson (1993: 78-83), Whitmarsh (2003: 28), Korenjak (2003).
[177] Gleason (1995: xxiii).
[178] Philostratus,*VS* 579, 623; Lucian, *Herod*. 8; Goldhill (2001: 157).
[179] Korenjak (2000: 96-114, 139-147,) Whitmarsh (2005: 25), Eshleman (2012: 39-49).
[180] Lucian, *De Salt.* 76, 83-4; Chronos, *De Salt.* 80; Jory (1986: 27), Goldhill (2001: 157).
[181] Connolly (2001: 84-88).
[182] Anderson (1993), Whitmarsh (2005: 24-31).
[183] For example Polemo, Favorinus, Alexander Peloplaton in Philostratus, *VS* 531-44, 489-492, 571-577. See Gleason (1995), Anderson (2003), Whitmarsh (2005).

rhetoric was a dramatic and imaginative art.'[184] Quintilian claimed that the aim of rhetoric was to control the emotions rather than the thoughts of audience members.[185]

Sophists could become immensely popular, wealthy and influential. Their rhetorical skills could earn them the honor of being chosen as ambassadors or as members of political delegations.[186] As such, sophists were members of the cultural, even political, élite. But their popularity did not rely only on the educated form of speech, historical themes and literary allusions that made their speeches attractive to a highly educated audience. Sophists appear to have also had a broader audience base and could find themselves competing for the same audiences attracted to 'popular' performance genres. Celebrity sophists could draw huge crowds.[187] There could be a variety of levels of appreciation for the sophists' craft. Like the plays of Shakespeare, sophistic performances could be enjoyed on a variety of educational and cultural levels. Audience members could enjoy recognising Attic vocabulary or literary allusions, be spellbound by the sophists' manner of visual presentation or find themselves drawn in by the occasionally melodramatic or sordid scenarios recounted by the speakers.

As sophists' participation in embassies suggests, public speaking was used for more than just entertainment. Persuasive speakers were vital for diplomacy but also for local politics and the court of law.[188] In the law courts,

[184] Scodel (1997: 501).
[185] Quintilian, *Inst. Orat*. 11.3.2; Scodel (1997: 501), Connolly (2001: 84-88).
[186] For another perspective on the effectiveness and lack of effectiveness of sophists in delegations, see Bowie (1982: 32-38). He also provides two useful appendices listing sophists and rhetors who served as ambassadors.
[187] Philostratus*VS*. Gentili (1979), Whitmarsh (2003), Anderson (2003). Eshleman (2012), on the other hand, argues for a more exclusive audience base.
[188] Chaniotis (1997: 226-234) discusses the importance of delivery and dress for Hellenistic statesmen. Webb (2009: 16-17) '…rhetorical performance provided an important forum for the Greek citizens of the Empire to assert their identity, to achieve social status among their peers

public speaking could have life or death consequences. Court cases and public assemblies could serve as public entertainment, as was the case in Classical Athens.[189] Such spectacles continued to draw crowds in the Hellenistic and Imperial periods.[190] Legal trials resembled performances in form and content. They had audiences and juries like agonistic festivals and also shared similar themes to dramatic performances.[191] Conversely, aspects of the law court could be found on the stage. Classical tragedy has its fair share of agons and forensic speeches.[192] Aristophanes' comedy *Wasps* pokes fun at an Athenian man's obsession with the law courts and contains a hilarious mock trial of dog accused of stealing cheese.[193] Elements of court trials were also in evidence on the Hellenistic and Imperial stages. Sophists could base their declamations on forensic speeches of the past or on fictional legal scenarios.[194] Trials were also in evidence in other performance genres such a mime.[195] Herodas' second mimiamb appears to be a mockery of a court defence speech, as delivered by the keeper of a brothel.[196] Trials real and fictional both held a fascination for their audiences.

Homerists and Other Entertainers

The boundaries between 'high' and 'low' culture were permeable, with élite audiences enjoying lower brow entertainments on occasion. Athenaeus

---

and their contemporaries and was one of the principal media in which relationships with Rome and the representatives of the Empire were constructed.'

[189] Hall (2006).

[190] Chaniotis (1997), Anderson (2003: 64-67).

[191] Hall (2006: 354).

[192] Scodel (1997), Hall (2006: 354-355).

[193] Aristophanes, *Wasps* 892ff; Hall (2006: 353-354, 387).

[194] Russell (1983: 28-39).

[195] Valerius Catullus' mime production *Laureolus* appears to have featured a trial or at the least an execution as the result of a trial, Juvenal, *Sat*. 8; Martial, *Lib. Spect*. 7. Choricius *Apol. mim*. 30 refers to court trials taking place at the conclusion of adultery mimes.

[196] Zanker (2009: 42-71). Zanker provides a useful discussion of the debate regarding possible performances of the mimiambs. For other discussions see Mastromarco (1984), Cunningham (1987), Konstan (1988).

mentions 'lower brow' entertainers that could be found at dinner parties of the rich, solo performers called *hilaroidoi* (also called *sinoidoi*) and *magoidoi* (also called *lysiodoi*).[197] Little is known about these performance types, though they appear to fall on the lower end of the cultural spectrum. Athenaeus characterises them as bawdy, comic performers.[198] In a pejorative description of their talents, Strabo claims these performers corrupted (φθείρω) earlier lyric practices. Corruption or no, these performance genres were ones that could be found at high-society gatherings.

Athenaeus also mentions rhapsodes, or 'Homeristai', who recited, sang or re-enacted scenes from Homer and perhaps other poets.[199] Homerists appear in a Latin and a Greek novel. They are some of the dinner party entertainment provided by Trimalchio in Petronius' *Satyricon*, helping to preface the arrival of part of the feast.[200] A Homerist also plays a role in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*, as do his collection of costumes and props.[201] These performers are fascinating 'cultural amphibians'. At the heart of the Homerists' performance business is the text of Homer— a text more fixed than any by the novelists' time, featuring in school texts.[202] The Homerists transform the literary backbone of the cultural élite into a live spectacle for the masses, complete with costumes, props and fake blood.[203] This popular theatre genre stemmed from a live performance tradition with venerable agonistic festival roots—the original Homeric singers, the *aoidoi*. Even as Homeric texts became fixed and passed into the domain of

[197] Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 14.620a-621f.
[198] Strabo 14.1.41; Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 14.620a-621f; Hunter (2002: 196).
[199] Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 14.620a-621f; Hunter (2002: 196).
[200] Petronius, *Satyrica* 59.1-3; Starr (1987: 199-200), Panayotakis (1995: 88-89), Schmeling (2011: 246).
[201] Achilles Tatius 3.20. See chapter five.
[202] Papyrus examples of Homeric school texts include P.Oxy II.223, P.Lon.Lit. 6, P.Rain.Cent. 20, P.Mert. I.3. Cribiore (2001: esp. 139ff) discusses ancient school curricula.
[203] Artemidorus 4.2 (p. 245 Pack).

élite education, to be read and memorised by élites, they were performed live in spectacles with mass appeal. The Greek novels, especially those of Chariton and Heliodorus, have many Homeric moments, quotations and allusion. Although it is likely that these educated novel authors were exposed to Homer as text, some of the novelists' readers may have had another frame of reference through the live tradition of Homericising theatre.

New Comedy

As with full-scale performances of tragedy, full-scale performances of New Comedy also seem to have faded out of popularity in the late Hellenistic/early Imperial period. As with tragedy, the lack of full-scale performances does not mean that New Comedy disappeared from public consciousness. Dio Chrysostom recommends reading Homer, Euripides of the tragic poets, and Menander of the comic poets in order to acquire to requisite amount of *paideia* to be considered *pepaideumenos*.[204] In the same manner as tragedy, comedy was performed at agonistic festivals by the equivalent of the *tragoidos* (or *tragoedus*), the *komoidos* (or *comoedus*). New Comedy also lived on through private performances in the homes of the extremely wealthy and culturally élite. [205] Pliny, for example, discusses having comedians as entertainment during dinner, and Plutarch goes so far as to say it would be easier to hold a symposium without wine than without Menander.[206] The popularity of Menander is attested by the wealth of Menander-related mosaics.[207] Displays of

[204] Dio Chrysostom, *Or*. 18.7. Easterling and Miles (1999: 105).
[205] Jones (1991), Csapo (2010: 140-167).
[206] Pliny, *Ep*. 9.36; Plutarch, *Mor*. 712b.
[207] Theocharidis (1940: 115), Charitonidis, Kahil and Ginouvès (1970), Kondoleon (1994), Borza (1995: 168), Ling and Ling (1997), Dobbins (2000), Stefani (2003), Csapo (2010: 140-162 figs. 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.6 and 5.7).

'Menander' in wealthy homes suggest not only that people read and enjoyed the playwright, but that the enjoyment of Menandrian comedy was a quality to be advertised to guests in the home. The images also reinforce the idea that communication about literature, especially dramatic literature, was not limited to text or speech. 'Menander' had a place in culture through a variety of media, through the visual arts as well as text.

Mime

The term 'mime' encompasses a variety of performances. Mime actors and actresses acted, danced or sang, without masks.[208] Choricius of Gaza claims

> Τίς δὲ οὐκ ἀπείτοι καταλέγειν ἐπιχειρῶν, ὅσα μιμοῦνται; δεσπότην, οἰκέτας, καπήλους, ἀλλαντοπώλας, ὀψοποιούς, ἑστιάτορα, δαιτυμόνας, συμβόλαια γράφοντας, παιδάριον ψελλιζόμενον, νεανίσκον ἐρῶντα, θυμούμενον ἕτερον, ἄλλον τῷ θυμουμένῳ πραύνοντα τὴν ὀργήν.
>
> Who would not give up trying to enumerate all [that mimes] imitate? Master, servant, merchants, sausage sellers, bakers, restauranteur, banqueters, contract makers, stammering little kid, youth in love, someone stoking their anger, another one quieting them.[209]

Mime was the consummate cultural amphibian, ranging from highly sophisticated 'literary' mimes to completely improvised performances.[210] As such, the genre had an extremely broad appeal—capable of attracting the highly educated, even the literary élite, as well as the masses. According to Plutarch, there were two types of mime performances: *paignia*, short scenes, and *hypotheseis,* longer more structured plots.[211] As Plutarch's description suggests, mime performances could be as simple or as complicated as the situation

[208] For more on mime see Reich (1903), Nicoll (1931), Wiemken (1972), McKeown (1979), Fantham (1980), Kehoe (1984), Fantham (1989), Csapo and Slater (1995), Panayotakis (1995).
[209] Choricius, *Apol. mim*. 110.
[210] For extant mime text and fragments, see Bonaria (1955-1956), Bonaria (1965) and Panayotakis (2010).
[211] Plutarch, *Convivial Questions* 712e.

required. Emperors and private individuals kept troupes of mimes and actors for private entertainment within the home.[212] Grander entertainments could be found on the stage or even the amphitheatre; Seneca refers to *mimicum naufragium*, a mime shipwreck.[213] John of Ephesos mentions a pair of mimes outside of a church in Amida who entertained a crowd with jokes and slapstick.[214]

Literary mimes could be written by those with social standing. The first century BCE mimographer Decimus Laberius was an *eques*.[215] His main rival, a former slave named Publilius Syrus, produced a popular collection of *sententiae*, known to the writer Aulus Gellius in the second century CE. There is possibility that the poet Catullus was a mimographer as well.[216] At the very least, he seems to have been familiar with mime stock themes.[217] Other elegiac poets also may have found inspiration in mime themes, such as those from the adultery mime.[218] The mixture of high and low cultural references even in élite literary genres suggests that similar combinations could be found in other genres, such as the novel. Crassicius Pansa, an erudite scholar known for his commentary on Cinna's *Zmyrna*, one of the most obscure poems of the neoteric movement, also kept company with mimes early in his career.[219] An interest in highly literary works did not preclude an interest in contemporary performance genres. Mime infiltrated élite and low culture, with unhindered traffic between the two.

---

[212] Pliny, *Ep*. 5.19; 7.24; Csapo and Slater (1997: 275), Hunter (2002).
[213] Seneca, *De Ira* 2.2.4-5.
[214] John of Ephesos, *Lives of the Eastern Saints, PO* 19, p 166.
[215] According to a popular anecdote, he may have briefly lost his rank when forced by Julius Caesar to perform in one of his own mimes, but was reinstated thereafter. Macrobius, *Sat.* 2.7.1-9, based on a lost Aulus Gellius account. Bonaria (1955-1956: 90-92), Giancotti (1967), Fantham (1989: 1), Panayotakis (2010).
[216] Perhaps the mimographer Valerius Catullus. See Wiseman (1985a: 190-196).
[217] Wiseman (1985a: 20, 190-196).
[218] McKeown (1979), Wiseman (1985a: 21).
[219] Suetonius, *De grammaticis* 18; Wiseman (1985b).

Herodas' mimiambs from the second century BCE give an early example of this cultural fluidity. His second mimiamb is a play on a law court speech, a very specific form of rhetoric. The speaker, however, is the owner of a brothel, named Battaros—'stutterer'—an uninspiring appellation for an orator.[220] The comic combination of erudition and *bathos* is pleasurable to a variety of levels of education. A much later (and more contemporary to the Greek novels) papyrus from the early or mid-second century CE shows a similar combination of high and low cultural references. P.Oxy 413, recto and verso, provides texts of two mimes. On the recto there is a text commonly called the *Charition*, which appears to be comical variation of Euripides' *Iphigenia at Tauris*. The heroine, Charition, flees from a group of barbarians with the help of her brother and a 'Fool'.[221] While Charition uses exalted language, the character of the Fool uses his flatulence as weapon. Tragic allusions and toilet humour grace the same performance piece, as in Aristophanes. As Edith Hall intriguingly points out, a fragment of what appears to be a Greek novel seems to have a similar pairing—a quotation from Euripides and a Fool figure.[222] On the verso of the same papyrus there is the text of mime, mostly in monologue that portrays the murderous schemes of an adulterous wife. This text, generally called the *Moicheutria*, follows an adulterous woman as she orders the deaths of a slave she loves, and the slave's lover, before poisoning her own husband. The mime appears to end with the reanimation of the husband—not dead after all—and the expectation of the woman's comeuppance.[223] Although their existence on the same sheet of papyrus does not necessarily signify a relationship between the texts—they are

[220] Hall (2013b: 109-118).
[221] Wiemken (1972: esp. 72-76), Santelia (1991), Hall (2010), Tsitsiridis (2011), Hall (2013a).
[222] Hall (2013a: 167 n 63) in reference to P.Oxy 3010, published by Parsons (1971).
[223] Wiemken (1972), Andreassi (2000) and (2001), Tsitsiridis (2011).

written in different hands, and writing material was often reused—it is quite possible that both texts represent, in full or in part, performances enacted by the same troupe.[224] This shows a variety in repertoire and also suggests that an audience could be as interested in tragic burlesque as in a more lurid performance without the same high culture allusions. As P.Oxy 413 suggests, two common subjects of mime were mythological or tragic burlesque and satirical takes on urban life. The subject of adultery appears to have been a perennial mime favourite. The 'adultery mime' is mentioned by authors across the centuries and cities, from Juvenal in Rome in the first century CE to Choricius of Gaza in the sixth century.

In less structured mime performances, such as the *paignia* described by Plutarch, scenes may have had abrupt endings, as Cicero attests (Cic. *Pro Cael.* 65). In Cicero's description, the curtain goes up, but perhaps depending on the stage scenery, doors could be slammed instead. Intriguingly, an inscription for thymelic games in Sparta, lists the need for four mimic doors or 'doors for mimes'.[225] On this lower end of the mime spectrum, there were skits involving physical comedy and slapstick fights, and occasionally genuine physical violence. A buffoon character with a shaved head, called the *stupidus* in Latin or the μῶρος in Greek, appears to have borne the brunt of the comic beatings. Violence could also be represented more realistically, or even in reality. The mime *Laureolus* by the mimographer Valerius Catullus seems to have told a bloody tale about the eponymous bandit leader.[226] Suetonius recalls a 'special effects' contest between actors in a production that left the stage awash with

[224] Wiemken (1972: 76-79, 108-109), Tsitsiridis (2011).
[225] *SEG* 11.923, 33ff.
[226] I will discuss *Laureolus* in greater detail in chapter eight. For further discussion see Reich (1903: 88-89, 198, 564), Wiemken (1972: 148-149), Kehoe (1984: 99), Coleman (1990: 64-65, 67).

blood. Juvenal refers to a crucifixion scene and Martial recounts a staging of the play in which the actor playing Laureolus is mauled to death by a bear.[227]

Performance in the Greek East

Chariton claims to be from Aphrodisias— a city with ties to Rome from at least the first century BCE, which also offers fascinating material evidence for performance culture from the first century BCE to late antiquity.[228] Zoilos, a freedman of Octavian, contributed to the building of a theatre there in the second half of the first century BCE.[229] This building would have been a prominent public feature during Chariton's lifetime. If the author of *Callirhoe* were indeed a resident of Aphrodisias, it is hard to imagine that he did not experience any of the performances the theatre offered, especially since there is evidence of agonistic contests in the city from the first century CE.[230]

Roueché notes that there are three buildings dedicated to public entertainment in Aphrodisias—the above-mentioned theatre, the Odeon (a small concert-hall from the late first or early second century CE), and a stadium.[231] She claims

> these buildings in Aphrodisias are excellent examples of their different types, but are in no way unique; each of them is paralleled in many other cities of the eastern Roman Empire, by similar buildings constructed, or extensively embellished, during the first, second or early third centuries A.D. They reflect the lavish programmed of public building of all kinds undertaken by the provincial cities in that period of peace and prosperity; but they also indicate the wide range of public spectacles and entertainments which had always been a central element in the life of the Greek city,

[227] Suetonius, *Gaius/Calig*. 57.4; Juvenal, *Sat*. 8, 187-88; Martial, *Lib. Spect*. 7. Cf. Coleman (1990: 64-65).
[228] See Edwards (1994) for a study of Chariton in the context of Aphrodisias, particularly on the city's relationship with Aphrodite, and also Tilg (2010: 2-36).
[229] Roueché (1993: 1), Jory (2002: 243).
[230] Roueché (1993: 161-163).
[231] Roueché (1993: 1-2).

> and which became more and more widely available, and increased steadily in scale and importance, under the Empire.[232]

Multiple public buildings in the city were decorated with representations of theatrical masks, including the propylon of the Sebasteion, a temple dedicated to Aphrodite and the Julio-Claudian emperors, and the demos. John Jory argues that while some of these propylon masks are open-mouthed and appear to represent comedy, tragedy and satyr play, there are other, close-mouthed masks that could represent pantomime.[233] At the very least, it is obvious that Aphrodisias was a city whose citizens were familiar with drama and theatrical conventions.[234]

There is an Aphrodisian inscription, perhaps from the first century CE, mentioning a troupe of gladiators and condemned criminals owned by a high priest, Tiberius Claudius Pauleinus.[235] Inscriptions, graffiti and statuary all attest that gladiators played a part in public entertainment.[236] Another form of entertainment was agonistic festivals or contests, with epigraphic evidence. Roueché notes that 'Aphrodisias, with its strong commitment to the cult of the Imperial house… held contests in honour of the emperors as early as the first century.'[237] She also suggests that it is possible that even in the first century CE the contests might not have been solely Greek, but could have had 'Roman' elements such as gladiatorial contests or *venationes*. List of prizes for contestants, dating from around the second century CE, give an idea of who else was competing: harp-singers, comedians, tragedians, poets, trumpeters, writers of

[232] Roueché (1993: 2).
[233] Jory (2002: 249-253).
[234] Roueché (1993: 71) mentions that 'Menander' was one of the most common names in Aphrodisias, and it is tempting to suggest a correlation with the appreciation of Menander the playwright.
[235] Roueché (1993: 62, plate viii, no. 13).
[236] See Roueché (1993), Junkelmann (2000). It is interesting that convicted criminals may have been part of gladiatorial spectacles in Aphrodisias considering there is a prominent criminal publicly put to death in Chariton.
[237] Roueché (1993: 163).

encomia, runners, wrestlers, pancratiasts, boxers, flautists, satyr performers, pyrrhic dancers, even Latin poets.[238]

Aphrodisias' interest in theatrical entertainments was not unique. Agonistic festivals were popular throughout the Greek world, especially the Greek East.[239] Louis Robert calls the increase in popularity an 'agonistic explosion'.[240] Besides seasonal festivals, permanent theatre buildings were also notable features for cities, so much so that Pausanias claims theatres are necessary for city building—that you cannot have a polis without a theatre.[241] The remains of theatrical buildings leave some clues as to what kinds of performances they may have once hosted.[242] A second century theatre inscription from Ephesos shows drawings of scenes from what appears to be mythological mime, including the characters of Heracles, Thetis, Pileous (Peleus), and Hephaestus.[243] The stage platform of the late second century theatre at Sabratha has reliefs of the judgement of Paris, including the Graces and the Muses, which corresponds to the characters onstage in the Paris pantomime described in Apuleius.[244] Pantomime masks adorn the propylon in Aphrodisias, as well as the so-called 'temple tomb' in Sidyma and the late first or early second century BCE South tomb in Cremna in Pisidia. Others are found in Caesarea and Jerash, from the same time period.[245]

Domestic theatrical decorations may serve as evidence for performances within the home, as well as a general interest in the theatre. At the very least,

[238] Roueché (1993: 168-174, no. 53, I-IV).
[239] Gentili (1979), Jones (1993), Csapo and Slater (1995: 186-220), van Nijf (2001). Chrysostom describes festivals in or. viii.9, xxvii.5, xxxv.14-16. Sifakis (1967) discusses Hellenistic festivals in Delos and Delphi.
[240] 'une explosion agonistique', Robert (1984: 38). See also van Nijf (2001: 310-311).
[241] Pausanias 10.4.
[242] Roueché (1993), Jory (2002), Dodge (2010).
[243] *Inschriften von Ephesos* 2091.
[244] Caputo (1959: 15-23, figs. 55-83), Kondoleon (1999: 323).
[245] Jory (2002: 252).

theatrical mosaics and motifs reveal not only a literary enthusiasm for poets such as Menander, but also a visual interest that appears to be mindful of the mechanics of performances through the depiction of costumes, masks and musical instruments.[246] The increase in evidence for private drama dates from around the same period as the appearance of domestic art of scenes of drama.[247] Theatrical room decorations appear to greatly grow in popularity in the Imperial period. John Chrysostom complains that wealthy people decorate their houses like those on the stage.[248] There are 'houses of Menander', houses that contain mosaics relating to Menander, in multiple cities in the Greek East.[249] Floor pavements in Antioch include images of actors in situations off-stage, and a number of Roman houses contain mosaics with spectacle imagery, especially imagery related to festivals.[250] Art subjects include the preparation for performances and spectacles, ranging from the capture and transport of animals for *venationes* to dancers putting on their costumes to actors studying their lines. Scenes like these emphasise the effort that goes into producing a spectacle, and in turn makes that effort into a spectacle itself by placing it before a viewer. These images can be said to anticipate 'the entry and immersion of the viewers themselves into a world that is both mutable and unpredictable.'[251] Those familiar with live performances could take pleasure not only in the act of watching a live performance but also in the contemplation of the effort and machinations behind the performances. The viewers of these kinds of art were not naïve spectators who could not conceive how an actor manages to take on a

[246] Wiseman (1985: 44-45), Parrish (1995), Csapo (2010: 147).
[247] Csapo (2010: 147).
[248] John Chrysostom, *Hom. in Matt.* 83 (*PG* 58, 750); Huskinson (2002-2003).
[249] Csapo (2010: 140-163).
[250] Kondoleon (1999: 326-327), Lim (1999), Huskinson (2002-2003).
[251] Bergmann (1999: 27).

role, but were rather interested by and versed in the intricacies of creating a theatrical illusion. In addition to recognising theatrical illusion on the stage or at the amphitheatre, such viewers could consider themselves participants in performances in the theatre of life.

In the picture that forms from the piecing together of this wide variety of performance genres and the ways in which performance was consumed, the vibrant performance culture of the period begins to shimmer back into life. In the Hellenistic period life was seen as analogous to theatre.[252] Bettina Bergmann astutely observes,

> Obviously, spectators at events, readers and hearers of texts, and viewers of art require different stimuli, and these modes of communication need to be distinguished. But the fact that such varied media were interdependent, that they were regularly combined and referred to each other, points to a social phenomenon larger than the passing event, to a framework of thought that was inspired by spectacles.[253]

The emperor Julian complains that Antioch is a city 'in which there were many dancers, many flautists, and more mimes than citizens' (ἐν ᾗ πολλοὶ μὲν ὀρχησταί, πολλοὶ δὲ αὐληταί, μῖμοι δὲ πλείους τῶν πολιτῶν) and Libanius claims the Antiochenes only care about theatre.[254] John Chrysostom, an opponent of the theatre, asserts that 'most of the spectators know who [the actor] is and what part he is acting' (Ἴσασι γὰρ οἱ πλείους τῶν θεωμένων, τίς ὢν τίνα ὑποκρίνεται).[255] Although he may exaggerate, Chrysostom's description of people rushing to get into the theatre and not complaining of discomfort from standing in the crowds evoke a culture fascinated by the stage.[256] The power of theatrical entertainment can be found in the seriousness with which it was taken as a threat by Christian

[252] Plutarch, *Lyc*. 6; Pollitt (1986: 4), Chaniotis (1997).
[253] Bergmann (1999: 13).
[254] Julian, *Misopogon* 342b, *Or*. 49.27 (Foerster 3.465).
[255] John Chrysostom, *Hom. in . Matt*. 20.1 (*PG* 57.287).
[256] John Chrysostom, *Hom. in . Matt*. 37.6 (*PG* 57.426), *De Anna* 4.1 (PG 54.660).

writers, who denounce of theatre again and again.[257] John Chrysostom complains of the content of theatre, and notes that his audience will recognise the stories he recounts:

> τὰ δράματα αὐτοῖς πάντα τούτων γέμει, μοιχείας, ἀσελγείας, διαφθορᾶς… Ὁ δεῖνα τῆς μητρυιᾶς ἠράσθη, φησὶ, καὶ ἡ δεῖνα τοῦ προγόνου, καὶ ἀπήγξατο…Ἠράσθη ἡ δεῖνα τοῦ δεῖνος· ἐπανελθόντα τὸν ἄνδρα ἔσφαξε διὰ τοῦ μοιχοῦ. Τάχα ἴστε τὸ διήγημα οἱ πολλοί. Τὸν μοιχὸν ἀνεῖλεν ὁ παῖς τοῦ φονευθέντος, κἀκείνην ἐπέθυσε· μετὰ ταῦτα ἐμάνη καὶ αὐτὸς, καὶ ταῖς ἐριννύσιν ἠλαύνετο· εἶτα αὐτὸς οὕτως ὁ μανεὶς ἀπελθὼν ἔσφαξεν ἕτερον, καὶ τὴν ἐκείνου γυναῖκα λαμβάνει. Τί τούτων χεῖρον τῶν συμφορῶν;
>
> Their ancient dramas were replete with adultery, lewdness and corruption of all kinds . . . One man loved his stepmother, a woman her stepson and in consequence hanged herself . . . The wife of a certain one fell in love with another man and with the help of the adulterer killed her husband on his return. The majority part of you will know this story. The son of the murdered man killed the adulterer and after him his mother, then he himself became mad and was haunted by Furies. After this the madman himself killed another man and took his wife. What can be worse than these disasters?[258]

Even as he condemns the content, he tells us that his audience is familiar with the stories of Hippolytus and the *Oresteia*. Pollitt claims, 'in this intellectual climate… the Hellenistic artist became a kind of playwright, actor and stage director in one'.[259] Although Pollitt refers to material art, his comment applies to Hellenistic and later writers as well. Chariton, Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus each use this theatrical framework of thought.

[257] For example, Arnobius, *Adv. nat*. 4.35 (*CSEL* 4.169-70); Lactantius, *Div. instit*. 6.20 (*CSEL* 19.560); Cyprian, *Ep. ad Donatum* (CCL 3A.7-8); Tertullian, *De spect.* (*CCL* I.227-253); Ambrose, *In verb*. 37 ps.118.27 (*PL* 15.1260-61); Augustine, *Conf*. 3.2 (*CCL* 27.27-28), *Civ. Dei* 2.8 (*CCL* 47.40-41), *De doct. Christ*. 2.3.4 (*CCL* 32.33-34).
[258] John Chrysostom, *PG* 62.693.
[259] Pollitt (1986: 7).

2. Theatricality

Introduction

As the previous chapter has established, the time period in which the novels were written was saturated with a variety of performance genres and performance contexts, ranging from sophisticated oratorical displays to crude improvised comedy, found anywhere from city streets to public theatres to private homes. Perhaps it is no surprise, then, that the novels show an awareness of contemporary performance and are themselves 'theatrical' in practical and theoretical ways, in addition to the prevalent allusions to performance literature.[260] In this chapter I will focus on the novels' theatricality in the broadest sense, with an eye towards their general engagement with the dynamics and theory of dramatic performance. The novels, I argue, are 'theatrical' in that the authors appropriate performance models and apply them to the novel form. They make use of popular and effective techniques from another medium to enhance their own. The techniques employed by the novelists engage with the act of viewing and of being viewed, the *sine qua non* at the nub of all theatrical experience. The experience of reading the novels is at times less like reading performance literature and more reminiscent of the experience of watching a live performance. The novelists appear to self-consciously engage with ideas of theatre. This interaction with dramatic theory often sets the events of the novels in contrast to tragic theatrical conventions. At times, the novelists seem to challenge the tragic aesthetic. Heiserman suggests the Greek novel stepped into the vacancy left by the 'disappearance of worthy drama',[261] as if the novels were

[260] Many allusions to tragic and comic texts can be identified by readers, as discussed in the introduction.
[261] Heiserman (1977: 91). See introduction.

an antidote to contemporary performance. I contend that rather than attempting to achieve 'worthy' (read: tragic) status for their protagonists,[262] the novelists are more often aiming towards the very performances Heiserman dismisses.

Chariton, Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus each use different narrative styles to communicate their stories, but all three borrow techniques found in live performance. All three reveal, at different levels, self-consciousness about the process of presenting a story to an audience. Chariton chooses to introduce himself as the author at the very beginning of his text, providing his readers with a personal narrator who comments on the story he presents. This interjecting, reassuring and omniscient narrator shapes the way the reader interacts with the novel and serves as a reminder that the story is in the act of being told as he guides the readers through the story. He addresses the readers directly during moments of high drama, commenting on the story's content and quality. The narrator emphasises the skill of the author and uses language that likens the story to a script for the stage in a manner that hints at a poetics of the novel, even setting up the novel in competition with drama. Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus use characters within their works to comment on the theatricality of their narratives, which also appear to contain ideas that resemble theories about the purpose of performance and storytelling that can be read as meditations on the novel genre. These possible interactions with literary or dramatic theory may amount to a 'poetics' of the novel, which does not privilege the 'textualised' tragedy of the élite cultural patrimony, but instead often diverges from it. The tragedy of the 'page', the available written versions of Classical tragedy, presents a different aesthetic from much of what would have been seen on the novelists'

[262] Most recently Montiglio (2013: 152, 229-230).

contemporary stage. Excerpts presented by star *tragoidoi* and tragedy as popularised by pantomime seem to have focused on the highly emotional aspects of tragic plots and were ruled by an aesthetic closer to 'melodrama', for example the compilation of Euripides' *Hippolytus* without the choral sections, pantomime dancers performing the madness of Ajax, or mime productions such as *Laureolus* and the *Moicheutria*.[263] Add to these the everyday dramas found in mime, and contemporary performance taste appears rather earthbound, with an emphasis on the enjoyment of witnessing and vicariously experiencing emotional highs and lows—an aesthetics of pleasure and entertainment.

When the authors characterise their novels as 'performances', they often do so with the intimation that these performances have been orchestrated by higher powers. Eros, Tyche and even Aphrodite have a hand in shaping the adventures of Chaereas and Callirhoe. Achilles Tatius' first person narrator Clitophon claims that his tale resembles *muthoi* (1.2.2) and also casts himself as a character in a drama designed by Tyche (1.3.3). In Heliodorus, the main characters eventually credit the god Helios with the stage-management of their escapades. These references to a higher power guiding the characters' actions may be oblique references to the control of the author over his text, the true higher power that propels the action in the novels. In this case, each reference to stage-managing deities reflects on the novelist, whose role then resembles that of a playwright. In classical tragedy, a god is frequently the surrogate figure for the playwright such as Dionysus in Euripides' *Bacchae* and Athena in Sophocles' *Ajax*.[264] The performances the authors create have two different sets of audiences. In the first place there is, of course, the ubiquitous yet invisible reader, who experiences the

[263] P.Sorb inv. 2252, Luc. *De Salt.* 83. See chapter one.
[264] Segal (1982), Ringer (1998).

action from outside the text, but often there are also visible spectators within the narratives themselves. These 'internal' audiences provide a theatrical frame within the works that place the protagonists on 'centre stage'. Most importantly, however, they can be said to act as models for the novels' real-life, flesh-and-blood reader. The novelists' internal audiences can comment on the action (either in speech or by emotional reaction) and prompt the reader to respond as they do, just like the Chorus in Classical tragedy, the body of 'built-in' viewers who not only mediate between the stage and the auditorium but also, on occasion, 'cue' the real audience as to the appropriate emotional response.[265]

The Poetics of the Novels

Despite any reservations regarding Aristotle's understanding and interpretation of Classical tragedy, his *Poetics* was an extremely important text in ancient literary criticism and a foundational text for peripatetic literary theory.[266] Despite the influence of peripatetic theory on later literary criticism, there is little, if any, evidence that educated readers in the first century CE and the following two centuries had access to Aristotle's text. It may be possible that readers of the novels could have been familiar with Aristotelian literary theory or its heirs, but it is impossible to prove. There may be evidence that Chariton and Heliodorus, perhaps even Achilles Tatius, were aware of literary theory regarding performance. Chariton and Heliodorus appear to engage with literary theory in the way that they characterise the action within their novels.[267]

[265] Easterling (1996), Segal (1996).
[266] Hall (1996), Halliwell (1998). Cave (2001) and Fantham (2001) discuss the work's *Nachleben*.
[267] Reardon (1991: 78-79).

Aristotle insists that plot, not character, is the most important element in tragedy. Plot is naturally a great concern in the novels, occasionally at the expense of character. According to Aristotle, tragic plots consist of four portions: the presentation of the initial situation or problem (πρᾶξις), followed by the operation of human fallibility (ἁμαρτία). This is followed by events that lead to crucial reversal (περιπέτεια) and recognition (ἀναγνώρισις) involving emotion (πάθη). Finally a tragedy's dénouement would involve a change of condition for the worse (μεταβολή).[268] The plot elements of the novels could be simplified to a problem (separation of the lovers), development (the lovers' adventures) and a solution (the lovers' reunion). Although these elements do not align with Aristotle's formula for tragedy, they do resemble the Aristotelian depiction of a plot as the tying (δέσις) and untying (λύσις) of a knot.[269] This conception of plot also factors into Hellenistic literary criticism of comedy, which owed much to peripatetic theory. Hunter explains:

> Hellenistic theorists refined the Aristotelian dichotomy into a tripartite pattern of *protasis* ('proposition' sometimes seen as coincident in the first act), *epitasis* ('tightening') and *katastrophe* ('conclusion')[270]

The novels, by the mere fact that they tell a fictional story with an introduction, a problem and a resolution, have a cosmetic similarity to stories on the stage. There is evidence that the novelists may have been aware of the similarities and differences between plays and prose narrative.

Niklas Holzberg calls *Callirhoe* a 'closet drama', and he is but one of several scholars who have highlighted aspects of *Callirhoe*'s structure that

[268] Reardon (1991: 102-103), Halliwell (1998: 187-196).
[269] Aristotle, *Poetics* 1455b25; Hunter (1985: 37).
[270] Hunter (1985: 37).

resemble dramatic performance.[271] Tomas Hägg calculates that direct speech makes up nearly half (44%) of the novel and Bryan Reardon claims that nearly 90% of Chariton's text is 'scene', categorising the remaining 10% as 'summary'.[272] Breaking down the novel into such components suggests that *Callirhoe* is in some way a highly detailed 'script'. While there is a large percentage of direct speech in the novel, *Callirhoe*'s interaction with drama goes beyond this simple structural similarity. Chariton appears to highlight one significant difference between his work and tragedy, using suspiciously peripatetic terms.[273] At 8.1.4, Chariton assures his readers:

> Νομίζω δὲ καὶ τὸ τελευταῖον τοῦτο σύγγραμμα τοῖς ἀναγινώσκουσιν ἥδιστον γενήσεσθαι· καθάρσιον γάρ ἐστι τῶν ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις σκυθρωπῶν. οὐκέτι λῃστεία καὶ δουλεία καὶ δίκη καὶ μάχη καὶ ἀποκαρτέρησις καὶ πόλεμος καὶ ἅλωσις, ἀλλὰ ἔρωτες δίκαιοι ἐν τούτῳ <καὶ> νόμιμοι γάμοι.
>
> And I believe that this final chapter will be most agreeable to its readers: it is a cleansing of the grim events in the earlier ones. No more bandits or slavery or lawcourts or fighting or suicide or war or conquest in this one; rather virtuous love and lawful marriage.

Reardon wonders if Chariton happens to have Aristotle in mind at 8.1, but suggests Aristotle's and Chariton's meanings differ.[274] He observes that Chariton's

> whipping-up of emotions for the sake of emotions is not what Sophocles is about, in the *Oedipus*, or Euripides in the *Medea*; it is what Chariton is about.[275]

---

[271] Holzberg (1995: 32).
[272] Hägg (1971: 294), Reardon (1999: 173).
[273] Müller (1976: 120), Heisermann (1977), Fusillo (1991: 44), Reardon (1991: 20-21), Ruiz-Montero (1996: 50-51), Tilg (2010: 130-137), Paschalis (2013: 166-168), Montiglio (2013: 11-12).
[274] Reardon (1999: 183). Rijksbaron (1984) takes Chariton's reading as a cue to understanding Aristotle's definition of *catharsis*—Aristotle's poet cleanses the plot before he begins of repulsive elements, while the novelist preserves those elements and cleanses them later in the plot, see also Tilg (2010: 133-134). Müller (1976: 134-135) suggests that Chariton has misunderstood or trivialised Aristotle.
[275] Reardon (1999: 182-183).

Reardon emphasises Chariton's sentimental aesthetic, and perhaps that is precisely the point Chariton wishes to make—he is *not* Sophocles, nor is he Euripides. He is not writing tragedy and he is not trying to either. John Morgan believes that this passage 'must be an echo of peripatetic literary theory, if not of Aristotle himself'.[276] Stefan Tilg argues that Chariton *does* have Aristotle in mind and does *not* misunderstand him, but is rather responding to the *Poetics* with a poetics of his own.[277] Through the choice of the word καθάρσιον, a well-educated reader could be reminded of Aristotle's 'through pity and fear tragedy brings about relief to these and similar emotions' (κάθαρσις: δι' ἐλέου καὶ φόβου περαίνουσα τὴν τῶν τοιούτων παθημάτων κάθαρσιν).[278] Although the precise definition of κάθαρσις is, to say the least, contentious,[279] Tilg prefers the common definition of 'purification' or 'cleansing' that connects the term to the pleasure (ἡδονή) felt when an audience experiences such pity and fear, which I agree is an adequate definition in keeping with the meaning of καθάρσιον in Chariton. Authorial intention aside, it is possible that the reader familiar with the *Poetics* or its heirs may have paused to ponder Chariton's word choice and drawn his own conclusions.

Where Aristotle offers pleasure through pity, fear and similar emotions, Chariton promises pleasure because of the opposite sort of circumstance. In this final, most pleasurable (ἥδιστον) book, the causes of such emotions are absent—no pirates, no slavery, no fighting. The very act of assuring his readership further banishes the possibility of pity or fear. And yet the book will also be cleansing (καθάρσιον). Tilg suggests that instead of a homeopathic treatment of an

[276] Morgan (1993: 183).
[277] Tilg (2010: 130-132).
[278] Aristotle, *Poetics* 1449b28.
[279] Else (1957), Golden (1962), Daniels and Scully (1992), Segal (1996), Halliwell (1998).

audience, it is Chariton's plot elements that receive treatment: a pleasant plot purges an unhappy one and leads to a happy ending—entirely anti-Aristotelian.[280] Perhaps it is rather dangerous to pit Chariton against Aristotle alone, but it is possible that peripatetic literary theory retained some conception of κάθαρσις, and that Chariton's word choice is not incidental. It is perhaps possible to read the hints of a defense of his genre in this proposal that pleasantness can be as homeopathically beneficial as pity and fear. Otherwise, Chariton's statement could reflect a different view of the purpose of tragic performances in general. Many Classical tetralogies may have been designed with optimism in mind, instead of despair. It is possible that by Aristotle's time, most plays were performed singly and thus out of context, which could have led to his darker description.[281] Although *Callirhoe* hardly resembles the sort of tragic example lauded by Aristotle, it does share features with the non-tragic plays of Euripides.[282] As in *Helen* and *Iphigenia at Tauris*, there is the element of escape from a barbarian threat, with a happy ending. On the other hand, Chariton's statement could reflect changing perceptions about the purpose of entertainment in his time. He was writing after Aristotle in a wide and varied performance context bound neither by full tetralogies nor single performances, and he may have thought the peripatetic definition no longer applied. If the reference to peripatetic theory is deliberate, then perhaps so is Chariton's marked contrast to the equation put forward in the *Poetics*. The seed for his formulation may be planted in the very beginning of the novel. Aristotle's κάθαρσις is a 'cleansing of passions' (παθημάτων κάθαρσιν). Chariton calls his work an 'erotic

[280] Fusillo (1999: 82), Tilg (2010: 134).
[281] Wise (2008: 383-385).
[282] Reardon (1991: 102-103), Hall (2013a: 136-139).

passion' (πάθος ἐρωτικὸν, 1.1.1).[283] He does not shy away from the fact that emotion is at the centre of his work, but rather highlights the fact from the very beginning.[284] The novel aesthetic is the pleasure brought about by the experience of passions.

Rather than misinterpreting peripatetic theory, Chariton appears to be presenting his own interpretation of the poetics of his novel, in dialogue with literary criticism. Tilg, rather unconvincingly, argues that Chariton is consciously inventing a new genre and therefore makes this point in order to underline that his poetics are a 'new' poetics, while Brigitte Egger states more generally that 8.1 'can supply the starting point for the poetics of the genre'.[285] I add that Chariton's interaction with peripatetic literary theory suggests an awareness of the debts his work owes to performance while at the same time revealing an ambition to modify theory about performance to serve his prose medium. It is important to recognise the self-reflexivity of the passage. In direct address to his audience, using the first person present tense verb νομίζω, Chariton personally voices a passage that brings to mind the *Poetics* even as it turns Aristotle's definition on its head. It is significant that Chariton presents a definition of his novel that is reminiscent of performance theory because it further reveals the theatrical pedigree of the author's thought.

The sentiments expressed at 8.1.4 are repeated several chapters later, this time as opinions held by characters within the narrative. In the final scene of the novel, when the protagonists return to Syracuse, Chaereas is reluctant to tell the

[283] Tilg (2010: 131).
[284] Perry (1967: 117-118), Reardon (1976: 128), Reardon (1999) suggests that whether or not Chariton referred to Aristotle, his phrase does not share meaning with Aristotle's. Fusillo (1999) discusses the numerous conflicting emotions in the Greek novels. Saïd (1994: 221) refers to scenes in the novels as 'Hellenistic melodrama'.
[285] Egger (1999: 115).

whole story, 'not wanting to pain the people with the grim events of the beginning' (λυπεῖν οὐ θέλων ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις καὶ σκυθρωποῖς τὸν λαόν, 8.7.3). But his father-in-law urges him to continue, 'for this is brilliant conclusion overshadows all the previous events' (τὸ γὰρ τέλος λαμπρὸν γενόμενον ἐπισκοτεῖ τοῖς προτέροις ἅπασι, 8.7.4). Konstantin Doulamis claims it is 'impossible' not to take Hermocrates' statement as a self-referential nod to the novel's conclusion and Chariton's assurances at 8.1.4.[286] Hermocrates reassures Chaereas that the end of his story makes up for its distressing beginning, a sure echo of book eight's opening.[287]

This echo serves to reinforce Chariton's claim, now coming from the voice of one of the novel's greatest authorities, a Greek *strategos* and historical personage.[288] The context, the final scene of the novel, in which the story is told again to an engrossed crowd in the theatre in Syracuse, adds additional weight to the claim. The Syracusan people play the role as an internal audience upon which a reader might model his response, but also serve as proof that Chariton's assurances are correct. A story with a grim start and a happy conclusion is enjoyable and is enjoyed—Chaereas finishes his story and 'congratulations from everyone followed closely on these things' (εὐχαὶ παρὰ πάντων ἐπὶ τούτοις ἐπηκολούθησαν, 8.8.12). In this way, Chariton gives the reader his personal promise, then echoed by Hermocrates and 'proved' by the internal audience's reaction to Chaereas' recitation of the events of the novel.

[286] Doulamis (2012: 28). Doulamis somewhat misleadingly uses 'grim διηγήματα' in his translation of 8.7.3, where Chariton simply writes σκυθρωποῖς, which gives the illusion of an even greater similarity to Chariton's statement at 8.1.4.
[287] Hägg (1971: 259-260), Tilg (2010: 134-135). For Doulamis (2012: 29) this instance is but one of a series in which authorial statements are voiced by characters within the narrative.
[288] For further discussion of the character of Hermocrates see Billault (1989).

Echoes of Chariton's formula may be found in Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus. The later novelists may not be referencing directly, but they too appear to differentiate their stories from tragic formulae. Towards the end of Achilles Tatius' novel, Clitophon, Leucippe and her father Sostratus are invited to dinner with the high priest. Sostratus invites Clitophon to speak, saying:

> τὸ δὲ λοιπόν, ὅπερ ἐστὶ μῦθος, λέγε, τέκνον Κλειτοφῶν, μηδὲν αἰδούμενος. καὶ γὰρ εἴ τί μοι συμβέβηκε λυπηρόν, μάλιστα μὲν οὐ σόν ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ τῆς Τύχης· ἔπειτα τῶν ἔργων παρελθόντων ἡ διήγησις τὸν οὐκέτι πάσχοντα ψυχαγωγεῖ μᾶλλον ἢ λυπεῖ.
>
> as for the remainder, whatever the story is, tell it, my boy Clitophon, and do not be ashamed. Even if it has caused me some trouble, above all it is not your fault, but Tyche's; and besides, the narrative of things past is more likely to captivate the soul of a man who is no longer suffering than to pain him. (8.4.3-4)

The verb ψυχαγωγέω relates to the term term ψυχαγωγία, which has theatrical connotations. Plato connects it with tragedy, and Aristotle claims it can arise from plot reversals or the spectacle itself.[289] The term can mean to 'beguile' or 'bewitch' the soul, perhaps even the 'guidance of the soul'.[290] Sostratus here seems to imply that a tale of suffering is beguiling, even enjoyable, to someone who is not currently suffering.[291] One is reminded of the psychology behind Aeneas' encouragement of his men in *Aeneid* 1, that after they have escaped from their perils at sea they will probably derive pleasure from remembering their adventures.[292] His aphorism sounds like an advertisement for reading the novel, and suggests that *Leucippe and Clitophon* is not a cure-all tonic for those low in spirit, but rather an entertainment for anyone. It implies a poetics of sheer pleasure. A similar formula is found in the *Odyssey*. The suitors in Ithaca and the

[289] Plato, *Min*. 321a (ψυχαγωγικώτατον); Aristotle, *Poetics* 1450a33-5 and 1450b16-17. It can also be prompted by rhythm and meter, Isocrates 9.10-11.
[290] Asmis (1986: 157).
[291] Whitmarsh (2011: 91-92).
[292] Virgil, *Aeneid* 1.198-203.

nobles in the Phaeacian court find it pleasurable to hear the troubles of others, not as a form of consolation but as pure entertainment.[293] Earlier in the novel, Clitophon's new acquaintance Menelaus and cousin Clinias become downcast after recounting their own sorrows, so Clitophon decides it is time to cheer them up with 'a discussion of love bringing on erotic bewitchment' (λόγον ἐρωτικῆς ἐχόμενον ψυχαγωγίας, 2.35.1). This 'erotic bewitchment' is hardly Plato or Aristotle's ψυχαγωγία, depending on tragic reversals. Achilles Tatius, like Chariton, seems to take a tragic concept and modify it to describe a different aesthetic.[294]

Sostratus blames Tyche for the bulk of his troubles. Although he does not use theatrical language, his emphasis on the role of the gods harks back to Clitophon's claim that Tyche had a certain fate in store for him, which Clitophon characterised as a drama. In addition, Sostratus' words about the enjoyment of a tale of troubles past resonate with the sententious statements that appear throughout the novel regarding the merits of listening to or telling a personal account. The reference to past trials and present contentment could be a hint from the author that his tale is coming to a close and that now his reader can read over Clitophon's subsequent version of events without the tension that he may have felt before. The statement is subtler here, but there is a resemblance to Chariton's reassurances to his readers at *Callirhoe* 8.1.4. It is even closer to the words of Hermocrates at 8.7.4 and it may be no coincidence that both statements are pronounced by the heroines' fathers as they encourage their daughters' partners to retell the events of both novels.

[293] Homer, *Odyssey* 1.325-355 and 9.1.1-13.1.23.
[294] His 'erotic bewitchment' (ἐρωτικῆς ψυχαγωγίας) might recall Chariton's 'erotic passion' (πάθος ἐρωτικὸν, 1.1.1).

Heliodorus' novel also differentiates itself from tragedy. When Cnemon reacts with suspicion to the discovery of the dead Thisbe and her written confession, he addresses his fears to her corpse: 'you have come across the sea to play another Attic tragedy against me, but in an Egyptian setting!' (διαπόντιος ἥκεις ἑτέραν καθ' ἡμῶν σκηνὴν Ἀττικὴν καὶ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ τραγῳδήσουσα, 2.11.2).[295] Theagenes responds to his fears with gentle ridicule: 'For you cannot say that Thisbe has cast a spell on me and my eyesight, for I have no share in your drama' (οὐ γὰρ δὴ κἀμέ τε καὶ τὴν ἐμὴν ὄψιν εἴποις ἂν ὡς ἐγοήτευσεν, οὐδὲν κοινωνοῦντα τοῦ δράματος, 2.11.3). Theagenes intends to reassure his friend that there are no more sinister plots afoot, but it is thought-provoking that he should phrase it in such a way. Cnemon mentions Attic tragedy and one of the novel's protagonists denies any involvement with such drama. The verb γοητεύω could remind a reader of Gorgias' famous words on the power of *logos*,[296] that it can bewitch and beguile the psyche (τὴν ψυχὴν ἐφαρμάκευσαν καὶ ἐξεγοήτευσαν).[297] Theagenes is not ensnared by Thisbe's words from beyond the grave.

Later in the novel the reunion of Calasiris and his sons is upstaged by the 'unexpected entry' of Chariclea and her recognition scene with Theagenes. Heliodorus adds:

> Ἐφ' ἅπασι τὸ ἐρωτικὸν μέρος τοῦ δράματος ἡ Χαρίκλεια καὶ ὁ Θεαγένης ἐπήκμαζεν, ὡραῖοι καὶ χαρίεντες οὕτω νέοι παρ' ἐλπίδα πᾶσαν ἀλλήλους ἀπειληφότες καὶ πλέον τῶν ἄλλων εἰς τὴν ἐφ' ἑαυτοὺς θέαν τὴν πόλιν ἐπιστρέφοντες.
>
> Before everyone, Theagenes and Chariclea flourished, as the romantic part of the drama. They, graceful and in the bloom of youth,

[295] Paulsen (1992: 108), Hunter (1998: 44-45), Brethes (2007a: 119-120).
[296] For further on the bewitching power of *logos* see Lada-Richards (1993: 103-105).
[297] Gorgias, *Hel.* 14.

> who against all hope were now reunited: the city was turned upon the sight of them more than upon any of the other participants. (7.8.2)

The citizens, described earlier as seeming like 'judges in a theater',[298] at this point appear to cast their votes. In the theatrical contest placed before them, the residents of the city prefer the story of a man and woman in love to the story of Calasiris and his sons, which is often associated with tragedy and epic.[299] With this Heliodorus returns the story's focus to its young protagonists, and perhaps makes a statement on the poetics or the status of the novel. Heliodorus comments that episode's 'ending turned from a tragic tone to a comic one' (εἰς κωμικὸν ἐκ τραγικοῦ τὸ τέλος κατέστρεφε).[300] In a theatrical kind of contest, Heliodorus' internal audience chooses the love story, particularly two 'who against all expectation were now reunited'.[301] This choice, in which the romantic aspect of the novel wins out, suggests an aesthetics similar to Chariton's πάθος ἐρωτικὸν. This preference for an emotional, even romantic, performance could be grounded to some extent in contemporary cultural preferences, especially the erotic aesthetics associated with the wildly popular pantomime. Audiences craved seeing passion on the stage and on the page.

When Chariclea and Theagenes are captured by Ethiopians, Heliodorus announces:

> Καὶ ἦν ὥσπερ ἐν δράματι προαναφώνησις καὶ προεισόδιον τὸ γινόμενον· ξένοι καὶ δεσμῶται τὴν σφαγὴν ὀλίγῳ πρόσθεν τὴν αὐτῶν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ταλαντεύσαντες οὐκ ἤγοντο πλέον ἢ προεπέμποντο ἐν

[298] ἡ πόλις δὲ ὥσπερ ἐκ θεάτρου περιεστῶσα τοῦ τείχους ἠθλοθέτει τὴν θέαν, 'the entire population of the city lining the walls, watching like the presiding judges in a theater.' (Heliodorus 7.6.4).
[299] Calasiris can be likened to Odysseus, or to the tragic Jocasta in Euripides' *Phoenician Women*. His sons are similar to Hector and Achilles, or Eteocles and Polyneices. Fusillo (1989: 41-42), Mariono (1990), Montes Cala (1992: esp. 235), Paulsen (1992: 164-172), Dworacki (1996), Montiglio (2013: 114-116). I would argue that the scene may have more in common with tragic burlesque than the happy ending Euripides' late plays.
[300] Bartsch (1989: 132), Paulsen (1992: 70), Montes Calas (1992: 228), Montiglio (2013: 124).
[301] Montes Cala (1992: 230).

> αἰχμαλώτῳ τύχῃ πρὸς τῶν ὀλίγον ὕστερον ὑπηκόων δορυφορούμενοι.
>
> It was like the *proanaphonesis* and *proeisodion* in a drama: foreigners, prisoners in chains who a moment ago had been weighing out their slaughter before their eyes, were now not being led but rather escorted as prisoners, guarded by those who were soon to be their subjects. (8.17.5)

Again Heliodorus uses language from the theatre, but the obscurity of *proanaphonesis* and *proeisodion* make it difficult to understand his metaphor.[302] Although the exact theatrical comparison implied may be uncertain, Heliodorus' description of Theagenes and Chariclea's situation may shed some light on the terms in context. Morgan translates them respectively as 'the preliminary appearance and introduction of the actors in the theater'.[303] Such specialised theatrical terms could suggest a meaning beyond a superficially 'theatrical' metaphor. In a very literal sense Theagenes and Chariclea are heading towards a public stage—the religious festival in Meroe.[304] This brief aside highlights the themes of performance that are taken up through the end of the novel. It is also a moment of foreshadowing, revealing that Chariclea and Theagenes will rule these people—a flash of omniscience from the narrator, who has steered clear of any long-term pronouncements regarding Chariclea and Theagenes' future. Its position at the end of book eight gives it a similar intimation of an ending as that provided by Chariton at the beginning of his eighth and final book, when he promises his reader an end to his protagonists' dangers and heartbreak in a book meant to be 'most pleasurable' and 'an antidote' to the events of the previous books (8.1.4). While Chariton's authorial intervention is overt, Heliodorus'

[302] Morgan (1989b: 535 n 193).
[303] Morgan (1989b: 535). Marino (1990: 210) defines the terms as a '*un prologo e un preludio*'.
[304] Marino (1990: 210).

reassurance is subtle, but also cloaked in language related to drama, as the author borrows another technique from the stage.

Deities and Directors

Chariton, Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus choose happy endings over tragic ones, but they do not repudiate drama when they reject the tragic formula. Instead, all three novelists use theatrical metaphors to describe various twists and turns within their narratives. Divinities and *daimones* act as dramatists and stage managers, setting off series of events or placing characters in certain places at certain times. In Chariton, Callirhoe has many suitors, 'But Eros wanted to put together his own match' (ὁ δὲ Ἔρως ζεῦγος ἴδιον ἠθέλησε συμπλέξαι, 1.1.3). The verb συμπλέκω could share connotations with its root πλέκω and the noun πλοκή, which are used in the *Poetics* to refer to plot construction.[305] The god places Chaereas into her path.

> ἐκ τύχης οὖν περί τινα καμπὴν στενοτέραν συναντῶντες περιέπεσον ἀλλήλοις, τοῦ θεοῦ πολιτευσαμένου τήνδε τὴν συνοδίαν ἵνα ἑκάτερος τῷ ἑτέρῳ ὀφθῇ.
>
> And so by chance/Tyche, the two walked headlong into each other at a narrow intersection—a meeting contrived by the god so that each of them saw the other (1.1.6).

It is perhaps no coincidence that Tyche is also implicated in the protagonists' first encounter, as both the narrator and characters in the narrative attribute responsibility for plot developments to Tyche herself.[306] The satrap Mithridates, a character well aware of the importance of performance, advises Chaereas:

---

[305] Aristotle *Poetics* 1456a 9-10, 'that is to say, the plot and the dénouement. Many put the plot together well but end things badly' (τοῦτο δέ, ὧν ἡ αὐτὴ πλοκὴ καὶ λύσις. πολλοὶ δὲ πλέξαντες εὖ λύουσι κακῶς).

[306] Hägg (1983), Robiano (1984), Philippides (1988), Van Steen (1998). Brethes (2007a: 40) discusses the deities' roles in reference to New Comedy.

> ἐπεὶ δὲ ἡ φιλόκαινος Τύχη δρᾶμα σκυθρωπὸν ὑμῖν περιτέθεικε, βουλεύσασθαι δεῖ περὶ τῶν ἐξῆς φρονιμώτερον
>
> but since fickle Tyche has set you in a grim drama, you must more prudently weigh what to do next. (4.4.2)

Achilles Tatius also credits Tyche and Eros with creating theatrical situations. Clitophon considers himself a character in a drama devised by Tyche and the Moirai. He explains that his father intended him to marry his half-sister Calligone, but that the Moirai had chosen another bride for him (1.3.2). He continues with the pronouncement that when he was 19 years old, 'Tyche began the drama' (ἤρχετο τοῦ δράματος ἡ Τύχη, 1.3.3).[307] In a case of mistaken identity, Callisthenes, a suitor for Leucippe's hand, kidnaps Clitophon's half-sister Calligone. He hires a band of men who disguise themselves as women to gain access to their target. The kidnapping comes to a happy conclusion when Callisthenes falls in love with his victim. He professes his love and apologises for his actions, claiming 'Eros created my role as a bandit, Eros made me contrive these wiles to get you' (Ἔρως δέ με λῃστείας ὑποκριτὴν πεποίηκε καὶ ταύτας ἐπὶ σοὶ πλέξαι τὰς τέχνας, 8.17.3).[308] Achilles Tatius uses πλέκω as well as the theatrical term ὑποκριτής, a professional stage-performer acting a role. It is also a term used by declaimers in reference to public speaking. Aelius Aristides for example, even uses ὑποκρίνεσθαι with an accusative of a proper name, as if in the theatre, when discussing impersonating a historical figure (ἂν μὲν Δημοσθένην ἢ Μιλτιάδην ἢ Θεμιστοκλέα ἢ τὸν ὁμώνυμον ὑποκρίνομαι).[309] In Philostratus, Scopelianus impersonates (ὑπεκρίνετο) the behaviour of Darius and Xerxes, and Polemo is quoted referring to a sophist's ability to perform well

[307] A similar formula, τοῦ δράματος ἤρχετο, is found later in the novel at 7.2.1, when a man disguised as a fellow prisoner lies to Clitphon.
[308] Morales (2004: 62).
[309] Aelius Aristides, *Or.* 28.6.

(καλῶς ὑποκρίνεσθαι).[310] As in Chariton, Eros creates a dramatic production using dramatic language.

In Heliodorus the plot twists are not attributed to Eros but rather to Helios, along with Tyche and unnamed *daimones*. Calasiris uses theatrical terms to suggest that a daimon used a human woman like a theatrical mask.

> Ἀρχὴν δὴ τῶν ἐσομένων καὶ προαγορευθέντων μοι πρὸς τοῦ θείου δυσχερῶν τὴν γυναῖκα φωράσας καὶ συνεὶς ὡς τῶν πεπρωμένων ἐστιν ὑπόκρισις καὶ ὡς ὁ τότε εἰληχὼς δαίμων οἱονεὶ προσωπεῖον αὐτὴν ὑπῆλθε
>
> detecting that the woman was the beginning of the misfortunes to come that had been foretold to me by the divine, and undertanding she was a role of destiny and that the daimon to whose ot I had fallen at that time had, as it were, put her on as a mask (2.25.3)

Near the end of the novel, Heliodorus describes the Ethiopian king Hydaspes looking out at his subjects 'weeping from both pleasure and pity at the stage management of destiny/Tyche' (πρὸς τὴν σκηνοποιΐαν τῆς τύχης ὑφ᾽ ἡδονῆς τε ἅμα καὶ ἐλέου δακρύοντας, 10.16.3). The remarkable events of Chariclea's return and recognition are called 'the stage-management of destiny/Tyche'. The gymnosophist Sisimithres also puts the events of the novel in a dramatic context:

> νῦν τὴν κορωνίδα τῶν ἀγαθῶν καὶ ὥσπερ λαμπάδιον δράματος τὸν νυμφίον τῆς κόρης τουτονὶ τὸν ξένον νεανίαν ἀναφήναντες. Ἀλλ᾽ αἰσθανώμεθα τοῦ θείου θαυματουργήματος καὶ συνεργοὶ γινώμεθα τοῦ ἐκείνων βουλήματος
>
> Now, the conclusion of these blessings and, as it were, the *lampadion* of the drama: they have produced this foreign youth here as the betrothed of the maiden. Now let us recognise the divine miracle and become collaborators in the god's design (10.39.2-3)

Sisimithres encourages everyone to join in and play their part in a production stage-managed by gods. He calls the spectacle a 'wonder-work'

[310] Philostratus, *VS* 520 and 541.

(θαυματούργημα), the sort of show created by a 'wonder-worker' or 'showman' (θαυματουργός).

All three novels carry a general suggestion that the resulting plots are stage-managed by deities and the protagonists are (conscious or unconscious) actors on a world-stage.[311] These self-reflective comments on the 'theatricality' of the protagonists' lives fit well into contemporary cultural discourse regarding the metaphor of the *theatrum mundi*.[312] If all the world's a stage, then it is no surprise to consider the protagonists as 'actors' performing their lives. In all likelihood a contemporary reader would have been able to recognise these formulations as metaphors, but could also have been able to connect them with actual performers and performance genres. It is my contention that a close acquaintance with the performance related terms used in the novels would add a deeper level of meaning and perhaps greater enjoyment.

The Author as Dramatist

Of the novel authors, Chariton is unique in the frequency of his 'authorial interventions', in which he directly addresses the reader, as the author or narrator. In doing so, he reminds his audience of his presence and his role as author/presenter. These interventions offer Chariton the opportunity to emphasise his skills at scene-setting and reveal a theatrical self-consciousness. The most famous example is Chariton's interjection during his description of the trial between Mithridates and Dionysius at Babylon. Mithridates orchestrates the

[311] Artemidorus 2. 37, Pausanias 4.30.2 refer to Tyche as a divinity. See also Robiano (1984), Philippides (1988), Van Steen (1998).
[312] Pollitt (1986), Chaniotis (1997), and Edwards (2002) each highlight Hellenistic awareness of the world as a stage.

'miraculous' appearance of Chaereas, whom Callirhoe and the trial audience considered dead. Chariton writes,

> Τίς ἂν φράσῃ κατ᾽ ἀξίαν ἐκεῖνο τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ δικαστηρίου; ποῖος ποιητὴς ἐπὶ σκηνῆς παράδοξον μῦθον οὕτως εἰσήγαγεν; ἔδοξας ἂν ἐν θεάτρῳ παρεῖναι μυρίων παθῶν πλήρει· πάντα ἦν ὁμοῦ, δάκρυα, χαρά, θάμβος, ἔλεος, ἀπιστία, εὐχαί.
>
> Who could sufficiently describe that courtroom scene? What dramatist ever set such an extraordinary situation on the stage? One would have thought himself in a theatre filled with innumerable emotions. All were there at once—tears, joy, astonishment, pity, disbelief, prayers. (5.8.2)

He uses the same phrase τίς ἂν φράσῃ again in book eight, as he describes the day Chaereas and Callirhoe prepare to sail back to Syracuse. He asks, 'Who could describe that day's number of doings, with its varying scenes?' (τίς ἂν φράσῃ τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκείνην πόσας ἔσχε πράξεις, πῶς ἀλλήλαις διαφόρους, 8.4.1). Naturally, the question has a self-reflexive element, as the answer of course is Chariton. He reminds the reader of his role as author, and at 8.41 uses the term *praxis* (πρᾶξις), action, a term that features in the *Poetics*.[313] I do not mean to claim that this is a direct allusion to Aristotle, but rather I suggest that Chariton could be aware of the word's connotations regarding dramatic action. It may be no coincidence that Chariton, like a playwright, crafts *praxeis* and it is possible that a reader familiar with the peripatetic tradition would recognise an association.

The statements at 5.8.1-2 once again bring attention to the performative quality of the work. Most scholarship has been preoccupied by Chariton's mention of a ποιητής.[314] It is an exciting phrase, as Chariton invites his audience to compare the product of his writing skills with any παράδοξον μῦθον a

[313] Aristotle, *Poetics* 1447a36, 1448b1ff, 1449b24ff, etc.
[314] Tilg (2010: 138-139), Connors (2008: 165), Smith (2007: 107-108), Morgan (1993: 217).

dramatist might set ἐπὶ σκηνῆς.[315] What sort of paradox was found on the tragic stage? It is possible that Chariton refers to the performances of his time, the products of a more 'modern' aesthetic such as the metamorphoses that were part of pantomime's repertoire. Horace looks down upon Procne turning into a bird and Cadmus into a snake, but these sorts of paradoxical transformations were the bread and butter of pantomime, which was by nature paradoxical in that a single dancer would play multiple characters and 'speak' without speaking.[316] Chariton invites us to view his narrative as one set on a similar (albeit wider) stage, or at the very least to place his efforts on the same level as those of a dramatist. Tilg proposes that Chariton may not cast himself as a dramatist competing with other dramatists. Instead, he competes as a writer of prose, against dramatists.[317] In other words, Chariton does not call himself a dramatist, but rather challenges dramatists to achieve onstage what he has accomplished in prose, while claiming for his medium the flamboyance of the stage. Chariton, I believe, has his cake and eats it too. He borrows from the stage but is free from stage practicalities.

Chariton's rhetorical questions challenge not only the limitations of live drama but also those of public speaking. In asking τίς ἂν φράση as well as ποῖος ποιητής, Chariton compares his authorship with the skills of a dramatist but also of a writer or speaker. The verb φράζω can mean to write or speak, and that ambiguity suits the style of Chariton's address and his role as an author. He 'speaks' through his written word. The question τίς ἂν φράση should not to be ignored, considering the novel's engagement with rhetoric and public

[315] Heiserman (1977: 77ff) discusses paradoxes in Chariton.
[316] Horace, *Ars Poetica* 187-188.
[317] Tilg (2010: 139).

speaking.[318] At 5.8.1-2 Chariton suggests that his own plot devices surpass those of a dramatist and his delivery betters that of a speaker.

Although Chariton's novel is more explicit in crediting the author with the talents of a dramatist, the *Aethiopica* and *Leucippe and Clitophon* also give credit to their authors, obliquely. After an imprisoned Leucippe gives an impassioned speech, her captor Thersander turns to his co-conspirator and raves, 'did you hear that incredible speech, filled with passion? How powerfully she spoke! Such a lament!' (Ἤκουσας ἀπίστων ῥημάτων, γεμόντων ἔρωτος; ὅσα εἶπεν· οἷα ὠδύρατο, 6.17.1). His praise of Leucippe's words reflects on the author. As mentioned above, there are several references to the stage-management of the gods in the final portions of the *Aethiopica*. Shadi Bartsch suggests that Helios, the sun-god, could be considered the *choregos* of the entire novel, which would lend significance to Heliodorus' signature at the end of the piece.[319] Heliodorus is the playwright, and Helios is the sponsor who provides the means for the entire performance. Heliodorus concludes his novel by revealing his name and claiming to descend from Helios (10.41.4). Even without the connection between Helios and Heliodorus, the hand of 'god' in a novel is first and foremost its author.[320] A recognition scene between Chariclea and Theagenes is so compelling that the audience were enraptured by this miracle of theatrical art (σκηνογραφικῆς ἐπληροῦτο θαυματουργίας, 7.7.7). The term σκηνογραφική means a spectacle in the theatre, or a theatrical scene painting, and here modifies θαυματουργίας,

[318] Ruiz-Montero (1991), Webb (2007).
[319] Bartsch (1989: 142-43).
[320] Morgan (1982: 221), 'Anyone who sits down to write fiction takes upon himself godlike powers'.

suggesting a miracle working complete with scene-painting. The author of the scene is therefore a theatrical wonder-worker.[321]

Internal and Extratextual Audiences

All three authors create spectacles that are witnessed by audiences within the novels. Helen Morales notes that *Leucippe and Clitophon* 'stages a series of extraordinary spectacles that fashion the reader, as well as the spectators within the story, as audiences of the drama'.[322] The internal audiences underline the fact that events of novels are fashioned with 'viewing' audiences in mind. Shadi Bartsch articulately expresses the way Heliodorus creates a visual experience for the reader:

> In reading and visualizing his descriptions of spectacles, we actualize ourselves as a second and extratextual audience, and these descriptions of spectacles are directed at us and take place for our benefit as much as for the plot's advancement.[323]

The *ekphraseis* of spectacles are not the reader's only way 'into' the text. The internal audiences are an important component of spectacle scenes. They serve as a model for the reader. They give the author an opportunity to alert the reader to the appropriate response to unfolding events. In addition, they provide the author with an outlet for self-praise—the appreciative internal audience is like a performer's 'plant' among a live audience, there to serve the performer's purposes.

Chariton's use of crowd reactions resembles a pattern found elsewhere in Greek literature, such as in Homer and in historiography.[324] In Homer, there are

[321] Walden (1894: 41-42).
[322] Morales (2004: 61).
[323] Bartsch (1989: 111).
[324] Kaimio (1996: 64-67), see also Hunter (1994), Ruiz-Montero (1994b), Schmeling (1974), Papanikolaou (1973).

short speeches that reveal the emotions of the crowd, as well as interjections by unnamed speakers, which Maarit Kaimio calls 'choric speeches'.[325] Historians such as Xenophon used similar techniques. Chariton expands on the pattern of crowd reaction and intervention by making internal audience response central to his work. Chariton's crowd scenes are 'apt to appeal to a listening public, making it easy for them to identify with the emotions described'.[326] His use of the audience as a guide for the emotional responses of his external audience has a parallel in classical tragedy. In tragedy, it is the Chorus who invite other characters to empathise with the protagonist's misfortune, while at the same time the invitation is extended to the real-life theatrical audience, who ought to be participating vicariously in the feelings of the *dramatis personae*. In Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus*, the Chorus refer to their own grief and also address the 'citizens of Thebes'.[327] These citizen witnesses are embodied by the real theatrical audience (in the original performance context, the citizens of Athens). The Chorus, through their own reactions and through direct address, subtly guide and coax the audience towards the proper form of response.[328]

For example, the internal audience increases the effect of Chaereas' surprise courtroom appearance in book five. The reader knows that Chaereas is alive and need only anticipate the reaction of the characters who do not share their knowledge. With his advance knowledge, he will not experience any astonishment at Chaereas' appearance. Chariton, through his address, invites him nonetheless to share the many emotional reactions of the internal audience, as if inviting him to imagine himself as the internal audience through the conditional

[325] Kaimio (1996: 64), borrowing the term from Hentze (1905).
[326] Kaimio (1996: 67).
[327] Sophocles, *Oedipus Tyrannus* 1216-1219, 1524-1530.
[328] Segal (1996: 168), Easterling (1996: 177-179). Morgan (1992: 91-92) describes the internal audience like the crowd at a live performance.

expressed in ἔδοξας ἂν ἐν θεάτρῳ παρεῖναι (5.8.1-2). As such, Chariton reconciles the original emotional disconnect between the two audiences and places his external audience in the shoes of his internal audience.

Chariton's deliberate, even self-conscious, conflation of audiences continues in the following debate between Chaereas and Dionysius. As Callirhoe's two husbands exchange heated words in an *agon* that resembles, to my eyes, a kind of *stichomythia* in prose, Chariton describes the reaction of the internal audience, 'all the others listened with no displeasure' (οἱ δ' ἄλλοι πάντες ἤκουον οὐκ ἀηδῶς, 5.8.6). As this passage follows so soon after Chariton's intervention, it is not difficult to link his two audiences. In fact, it is as if he were inviting his external audience to join in with the enjoyment of the internal one.[329] In addition, he invites his outside audience to recall that they are an audience and that his work is entertainment.

In Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus the internal audience takes on a similar role. When Leucippe must undergo a virginity test, 'the whole population of the town' (ὁ δῆμος... ἅπας) is present for the spectacle (8.13.1). When she is proven to be a virgin, 'all the people shouted for joy and abused Thersander' (πᾶς… ὁ δῆμος ἐξεφώνησεν ὑφ' ἡδονῆς καὶ τὸν Θέρσανδρον ἐλοιδόρουν, 8.14.2). In Heliodorus, the crowd is dumbfounded by what they witness, they 'were amazed, no one spoke nor moved' (θαυμαζόντων καὶ λεγόντων μὲν οὐδὲν οὐδὲ πραττόντων, 7.7.4). In stunned silence or happy cheers, the audience invariably supports the authors' ability to achieve shock and awe.

In Heliodorus these spectacles sometimes contain further hints of their nature as performances designed by a higher power. As mentioned earlier, the

[329] Kaimio (1996: 59).

people who witness Chariclea and Theagenes' recognition scene 'were enraptured by this miracle of theatrical art' (σκηνογραφικῆς ἐπληροῦτο θαυματουργίας, 7.7.7). The term θαυματουργία brings to mind a subliterary performance genre—that of the θαυματοποιός, or wonder-worker. The θαυμαποιοί performed a variety of tricks, such as juggling or conjuring, anything that would baffle spectators.[330] Wonder-working also plays a part in one of the novel's final spectacles:

> Ὁ δῆμος ἐτέρωθεν οὖν εὐφήμοις ταῖς βοαῖς ἐξεχόρευε, πᾶσα ἡλικία καὶ τύχη συμφώνως τὰ γινόμενα θυμηδοῦντες, τὰ μὲν πλεῖστα τῶν λεγομένων οὐ συνιέντες, τὰ ὄντα δὲ ἐκ τῶν προγεγονότων ἐπὶ τῇ Χαρικλείᾳ συμβάλλοντες, ἢ τάχα καὶ ἐξ ὁρμῆς θείας ἢ σύμπαντα ταῦτα ἐσκηνογράφησεν εἰς ὑπόνοιαν τῶν ἀληθῶν ἐλθόντες. Ὑφ᾽ ἧς καὶ τὰ ἐναντιώτατα πρὸς συμφωνίαν ἡρμόζετο
>
> The people on their part exulted with shouts of congratulation; people of all ages and situations rejoiced in unison over the turn of events. Most of what was being said they could not understand; but they pieced together the facts from what had previously happened regarding Chariclea; or came to a suspicion of the truth through a divine impulse who had designed the entire scene, and by whose means extreme contraries were joined together in concord. (10.38.3-4)

Everyone rejoices, even though it is perhaps unclear how they know what they are celebrating. Heliodorus proposes that a divine power may have worked the wondrous effect. Here the audience becomes part of the performance by means of the author.

As this moment in Heliodorus suggests, audience scenes in the *Aethiopica* and *Leucippe and Clitophon* do not always fit into the choric format often found in *Callirhoe*. Both later authors play the experience of a spectator and invite their readers to experience spectacles on multiple levels. In Achilles Tatius, the first person narrator alternates between the roles of actor and

[330] Reich (1903: 236, 320), Dickie (2001: 601), Milanezi (2004: 191-3, tables I and II).

spectator, giving the reader his own perspective on how he has reacted to a performance or how someone has reacted to a performance of his. For example, in book three, Clitophon tells his story to the general of an Egyptian cavalry regiment. Clitophon explains that he can use a sad story to make an emotional connection:

> Συμπαθὴς δέ πως εἰς ἔλεον ἄνθρωπος ἀκροατὴς ἀλλοτρίων κακῶν, καὶ ὁ ἔλεος πολλάκις φιλίαν προξενεῖ· ἡ γὰρ ψυχὴ μαλαχθεῖσα πρὸς τὴν ὧν ἤκουσε λύπην, συνδιατεθεῖσα κατὰ μικρὸν τῇ τοῦ πάθους ἀκροάσει τὸν οἶκτον εἰς φιλίαν καὶ τὴν λύπην εἰς τὸν ἔλεον συλλέγει. οὕτω γοῦν διέθηκα τὸν στρατηγὸν ἐκ τῆς ἀκροάσεως, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸν δάκρυα προαγαγεῖν·[331]
>
> When a man hears of another's misfortunes, he is inclined towards pity, and pity is often the means of friendship; for the soul is softened by grief over what it hears, and little by little these emotions at the mournful story change pity to friendship and the grief converts to compassion. And thus did I move the general by the hearing of my story, so that I brought him to tears. (3.14.3-4)

Again, Achilles Tatius proffers a gnomic statement that echoes dramatic theory. In his *Rhetoric* Aristotle discusses what produces pity, noting that men are moved to pity when they believe they could suffer a similar situation.[332] Aristotle then notes that one can excite pity through acting:

> ἀνάγκη τοὺς συναπεργαζομένους σχήμασι καὶ φωναῖς καὶ ἐσθῆσι καὶ ὅλως ὑποκρίσει ἐλεεινοτέρους εἶναι· ἐγγὺς γὰρ ποιοῦσι φαίνεσθαι τὸ κακόν, πρὸ ὀμμάτων ποιοῦντες ἢ ὡς μέλλον ἢ ὡς γεγονός…
>
> it follows that those who contribute to the effect by gestures, voice, dress, and with acting, are more pitiable; for they make the evil appear to be near, setting it before the eyes as either what has been or what will be…[333]

[331] O'Sullivan (1976) argues that δάκρυα προαγαγεῖν may be a half-line quotation or paraphrase from Euripides' *Iphigenia at Aulis* 1550 δάκρυα προῆγεν. Certainly there are echoes of the Iphigenia myth in Achilles Tatius, but I find it difficult to identify confidently a direct quotation from a similarity in two words.
[332] Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1386a13-14.
[333] Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1386a14. Clitophon's belief in this formula makes one wonder if he is expecting the unnamed interlocutor of the greater narrative to fall under the same spell as the general.

Clitophon claims his story provoked the sort of highly emotional response that could be triggered by the performances of star actors. Plutarch provides two such examples. He recounts that Alexander, the proverbially cruel tyrant of Pherae, had to rush from the theatre so that no one could see the tears of pity he cried over Hecuba and Polyxena as portrayed by a *tragoidos*.[334] Elsewhere he claims a certain Phocian's portrayal of Electra at a banquet moved the generals determining the fate of Athens after the end of the Peloponnesian war so much that they decided to preserve the city instead of raze it to the ground.[335] Later in the novel Clitophon shares his experiences at dinner with the high priest, Leucippe and Sostratus. As previously, his story moves his audience. The priest 'is amazed' (θαυμάζων) and Sostratus weeps to hear tell of Leucippe's suffering (8.5.8-9).

As Morales observes, 'the motifs of theatricality in the novel are crucially bound up with how its narrative design (or lack of it) is presented to the reader.'[336] Naturally, the questions of sight and perception are complicated by the novel's first person narrator, as everything reported in the novel is filtered

[334] 'Alexander—tyrant of Pherae should be his only name lest he disgrace his namesake. As he watched a tragic actor, felt himself more moved to pity through the pleasure. And so he jumped up swiftly and left the theatre, saying that it would be a terrible thing, if, when he was slaughtering so many citizens, he should be seen weeping over the suffering of Hecuba and Polyxena. And he nearly exacted punishment from the actor because the man had molded his heart, as if it were iron.' (Ἀλέξανδρος δ᾽ ὁ Φεραίων τύραννος ἔδει δὲ τοῦτο μόνον αὐτὸν καλεῖσθαι καὶ μὴ καταισχύνειν τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν. θεώμενος τραγῳδὸν ἐμπαθέστερον ὑφ᾽ ἡδονῆς διετέθη πρὸς τὸν οἶκτον. ἀναπηδήσας οὖν ἐκ τοῦ θεάτρου θᾶττον ἢ βάδην ἀπῆει, δεινὸν εἶναι λέγων, εἰ τοσούτους ἀποσφάττων πολίτας ὀφθήσεται τοῖς Ἑκάβης καὶ Πολυξένης πάθεσιν ἐπιδακρύων. οὗτος μὲν οὖν μικροῦ καὶ δίκην ἐπράξατο τὸν τραγῳδόν, ὅτι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ καθάπερ σίδηρον ἐμάλαξεν, Plutarch, *De Alexandri magni fortuna aut virtute* 2.1).
[335] 'Afterwards, however, when the leaders were gathered at a banquet, and a certain Phocian sang the parados of Euripides' *Electra*, with the opening "O daughter of Agamemnon/ I am come, Electra, to thy rustic court", everyone was moved and felt it to be a cruel deed to abolish and destroy a such a famous city which produced such poets' (εἶτα μέντοι συνουσίας γενομένης τῶν ἡγεμόνων παρὰ πότον, καί τινος Φωκέως ᾄσαντος ἐκ τῆς Εὐριπίδου Ἠλέκτρας τὴν πάροδον ἧς ἡ ἀρχή 'Ἀγαμέμνονος ὦ κόρα/ ἦλυθον, Ἠλέκτρα, ποτὶ σὰν ἀγρότειραν αὐλάν,' πάντας ἐπικλασθῆναι, καὶ φανῆναι σχέτλιον ἔργον τὴν οὕτως εὐκλεᾶ καὶ τοιούτους ἄνδρας φέρουσαν ἀνελεῖν καὶ διεργάσασθαι πόλιν, Plutarch, *Vit. Lys*. 15.3). Hall (1999: 114-115), Lada-Richards (2002: 415 n 107).
[336] Morales (2004: 62).

through Clitophon's perspective. When he describes the spectacles he witnesses, he serves as an audience. In particular, he is a spectator of Leucippe—from her arrival to her *Scheintode*, Clitophon describes himself as the audience to scenes in which Leucippe is the star attraction.

Achilles Tatius also calls on the mechanics of performance, particularly in his description of the location of characters and their lines of sight. Often he makes note of how a character (usually Clitophon) is able to see the other characters in a scene, clearly situating the characters in space. An early example is the arrival of Leucippe and her mother Panthea. He describes:

> ἐν ἀριστερᾷ παρθένος ἐκφαίνεταί μοι καὶ καταστράπτει μου τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῷ προσώπῳ.
>
> a maiden appeared on [Panthea's] left, who struck my eyes like lightning with [the beauty of] her face (1.4.2).

The effect of Leucippe's beauty seems heightened by the way she suddenly enters Clitophon's sight, the suddenness and violence of his reaction shown in the verb καταστράπτει. The specificity in sight lines continues with the dinner party that follows the ladies' arrival. Clitophon describes the felicity of the seating arrangement:

> συνεπίνομεν κατὰ δύο τὰς κλίνας διαλαχόντες (οὕτω γὰρ ἔταξεν ὁ πατήρ), αὐτὸς κἀγὼ τὴν μέσην, αἱ μητέρες αἱ δύο τὴν ἐν ἀριστερᾷ, τὴν δεξιὰν εἶχον αἱ παρθένοι. ἐγὼ δὲ ὡς ταύτην ἤκουσα τὴν εὐταξίαν, μικροῦ προσελθὼν τὸν πατέρα κατεφίλησα, ὅτι μου κατ᾽ ὀφθαλμοὺς ἀνέκλινε τὴν παρθένον.
>
> we sat down, divided two to a couch, as my father arranged, so that he and I had the middle one, the two mothers on the left, and the two maidens the right-hand one. I hearing of this happy arrangement, I could barely keep myself from embracing my father for thus settling the girl under my eyes. (1.5.1-2).

The clearly delineated staging and Clitophon's explanation of its effect on his view allows a reader to place the characters in space, understanding and

vicariously experiencing Clitophon's specific view. Clitophon claims he hardly ate, but 'gazed at the maiden... for that was my dinner' (ἔβλεπον τὴν κόρην… τοῦτο γάρ μου ἦν τὸ δεῖπνον, 1.5.3).[337] Leucippe is a feast for the eyes.[338]

Where in Achilles Tatius the first person narrator sometimes serves as a subjective audience that shares his experience and interpretation of spectacles with the reader, in Heliodorus it is the narrator's apparent objectivity that shapes the reader's experience of spectacles. Heliodorus deploys an internal audience in multiple descriptive passages in which one group of characters finds itself the subject of a viewing audience within the novel. The viewing audience gains all it knows about the situation in front of them from what they can see and hear—a circumstance that seems at first intuitive and inconsequential, but it is a fact to which Heliodorus often alludes. He is aware, and makes his reader aware, of the conditions of performance—conditions he uses to shape his readers' experience of the text. The opening scene shows Heliodorus' applied model broken down to its smallest components, where he denies the reader the extra knowledge or diegetic insights of a traditional first or third-person narrator, and instead forces the reader into the same position as a theatrical audience, separated and externalised from the action.

Bartsch notes 'Heliodorus is emphasizing the reader's role as spectator, and everything (as Morgan notes) is geared toward an intensity of experience for the reader.'[339] For Bartsch, this intensity of experience stems from *enargeia*, a staple of ancient rhetorical theory. The aims of *enargeia* were shared by performances on the ancient dramatic stage, particularly in the messenger speeches of Attic tragedy, but at the novelists' time this was perhaps seen most in

[337] Melite will usual similar language later in the novel, regarding Clitophon (5.13.1-5).
[338] For a discussion of the 'consumptive gaze' see Morales (2004: 24-33, 169).
[339] Morgan (1982: 260ff), Bartsch (1989: 115).

pantomime dancing, where the dancer has only his bodily discourse with which to communicate clearly with this audience. Lucian's dialogue on pantomime is full of talk clarity (σαφήνεια).[340] The idea of presenting a picture clearly and in full detail in the mind's eye is crucial to the success of *enargeia*.[341] According to Aristotle, it is also essential to the process of dramatic composition. Aristotle stipulates in the *Poetics* that a dramatist should visualise the plot and put it in front of his eyes (πρὸ ὀμμάτων τιθέμενον).[342] Closer to the novelists, Ps. Longinus also places visualisation at the heart of poetic composition, with Euripides as his primary example, an author who 'himself saw the Erinyes, and what he imagined, he as good as made the audience see' (αὐτὸς εἶδεν Ἐρινύας· ὃ δὲ ἐφαντάσθη, μικροῦ δεῖν θεάσασθαι καὶ τοὺς ἀκούοντας ἠνάγκασεν).[343]

One could say Heliodorus takes such a visualisation and writes it down, particularly in the opening passage of the novel:

> Ἡμέρας ἄρτι διαγελώσης καὶ ἡλίου τὰς ἀκρωρείας καταυγάζοντος, ἄνδρες ἐν ὅπλοις λῃστρικοῖς ὄρους ὑπερκύψαντες, ὃ δὴ κατ᾽ ἐκβολὰς τοῦ Νείλου καὶ στόμα τὸ καλούμενον Ἡρακλεωτικὸν ὑπερτείνει, μικρὸν ἐπιστάντες τὴν ὑποκειμένην θάλατταν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἐπήρχοντο καὶ τῷ πελάγει τὸ πρῶτον τὰς ὄψεις ἐπαφέντες, ὡς οὐδὲν ἄγρας λῃστρικῆς ἐπηγγέλλετο μὴ πλεόμενον, ἐπὶ τὸν πλησίον αἰγιαλὸν τῇ θέᾳ κατήγοντο. Καὶ ἦν τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ τοιάδε· ὁλκὰς ἀπὸ πρυμνησίων ὥρμει τῶν μὲν ἐμπλεόντων χηρεύουσα, φόρτου δὲ πλήθουσα· καὶ τοῦτο παρῆν συμβάλλειν καὶ τοῖς πόρρωθεν· τὸ γὰρ ἄχθος ἄχρι καὶ ἐπὶ τρίτου ζωστῆρος τῆς νεὼς τὸ ὕδωρ ἀνέθλιβεν. Ὁ δὲ αἰγιαλός, μεστὰ πάντα σωμάτων νεοσφαγῶν, τῶν μὲν ἄρδην ἀπολωλότων, τῶν δὲ ἡμιθνήτων καὶ μέρεσι τῶν σωμάτων ἔτι σπαιρόντων, ἄρτι πεπαῦσθαι τὸν πόλεμον κατηγορούντων.
>
> The smile of daybreak was just beginning to shine, the sunlight to shine on the hilltops, when a group of men in brigand kit peeped over

[340] According to Lucian *De Salt.*, a dancer must 'cultivate clarity' (σαφήνειαν ἀσκεῖν, 62), one dancer dances 'so clearly' (οὕτω σαφῶς, 64) he could be used as an interpreter, and emphasises the importance of 'the intelligibility of [the dancer's] movements' (τὴν σαφήνειαν τῶν σχημάτων, 37). Bussels (2012: 109-135, esp 110) discusses Lucian's description of dance and its similarity to Quintilian's view of rhetoric.
[341] Quintilian, *Inst. Or*. 8.3.62, 64ff; 6.2.29. See also the introduction to this thesis.
[342] Aristotle, *Poetics* 1455a 22-32.
[343] Ps. Longinus, *Subl.* 15.3. Whitmarsh (2011: 172).

> the mountain that overlooks the place where the mouth of the Nile flows into the sea that is called the Heracliotic. After standing a little while as they surveyed with their eyes the spreading sea: first they set their sights over the ocean, but as there was nothing sailing there for the plundering, their eyes were drawn to the beach nearby. Such was what was there: a ship, moored by her stern, empty of sailors but full of freight. This much could be discerned even from far off, for the weight of her cargo pushed the water up to the third of the boards on the ship's side. But the beach! —completely full of newly slain bodies, some of them surely dead, others half-alive and with body parts twitching, testifying that the fighting had only just ended. (1.1.1-3)

The famous opening scene showers its audience with visual information, in which every inference made by the narrator is substantiated by visual evidence. The narrator's pretense of the abnegation of complete knowledge leaves the interpretative legwork to the reading audience. Such a stunningly aporetic beginning sets the tone for a novel presented as observed by (rather than controlled by) the narrator.[344] Such observations are hardly unique among ancient novel scholars. Nor have previous scholars failed to note that the group of observers who initially serve as the eyes of the audience is a group of *apparent* bandits— they are outfitted like bandits (1.1.1), a visual cue instead of a statement of fact.

J.J. Winkler has attempted to examine this opening scene in terms of literary hermeneutics.[345] The idea that the introduction is part of a conscious literary game is not without merit, but I agree with Morgan that the bandits, largely, 'are a window through which the reader can engage with the fictional world'.[346] Heliodorus seems to offer the reader the illusion that they are experiencing the novel without narratorial mediation. Again in the words of Morgan, 'In Platonic terms the text masquerades as *mimesis* rather than pure

[344] As the novel goes along, the narrator/author's control becomes increasingly clear.
[345] Winkler (1982), Bartsch (1989).
[346] Morgan (1991: 89).

diegesis.' [347] Naturally, narrative cannot in truth be mimetic, 'except when recording direct speech'.[348] The text must then be formulated initially to relate to a reader as a reader. The 'pretence of a transparent text' to which Morgan refers is Heliodorus' effort to give the reader the sense of being an observer.[349] This sense of observation is conveyed by the language of detached observation, instead of insider description.

The reader's characterization as observer, or better, eyewitness, gives the novel its initial theatrical cast. From the very beginning the reader 'sees' the events related, or if narrated by a character within the story, 'hears' them. This emphasis on the sensory allows the reader to experience a performance in the mind's eye. Winfried Bühler and Martin Winkler have both commented on the cinematic quality of this opening scene.[350] The comparison serves to convey the descriptive quality of the storytelling. The narrative begins with a time, a place, and group of characters. Even the time of day is described (in evocative if puzzling terms) rather than simply stated, as is the location— the Heracliotic mouth of the Nile. The characters are 'a group of men in brigand gear'. These are the first clues for the audience that the forthcoming story will be mediated through a narrator who, though not in the first person, will reveal events as if they have been observed but not interpreted. Much has been made of the 'absence' of the narrator— unlike in Chariton, where the narrator interjects and addresses his readers, 'Heliodorus', as a narrator character, is unobtrusive, allowing his story and his characters 'to speak for themselves'. This very lack of intervention is, to my mind, a characterisation in itself. The narrator is himself an

[347] Plato, *Republic* 3.392C; cf. Morgan (1991: 89).
[348] Morgan (1991: 89).
[349] Morgan (1991: 89).
[350] Bühler (1976), Winkler (2001).

observer, one who makes no claim to privileged knowledge, who attributes every plot twist to the 'stage-managing' of various deities. Even in the naming of the gods responsible the narrator is unclear.[351] In this respect, the narrator Heliodorus is the first audience of the novel, and the first through which the reader becomes a 'viewing' audience.

Words for viewing or associated with viewing saturate the first phrase—ὑπερκύψαντες, ὀφθαλμοῖς ἐπήρχοντο, ὄψεις ἐπαφέντες—and continue through the second. These words for sight and seeing are followed by a remarkable and detailed description of the scene below. The narrator lavishes the reader with description, but withholds interpretation. All narratorial inferences are reinforced by visual evidence— the boat *appears* to be laden *because* it is seen to lie low in the water. A battle *appears* to have taken place *because* of the dead and dying scattered across the ground. And later, as Morgan translates 'to judge by the signs this had been no proper battle' (Ἦν δὲ οὐ πολέμου καθαροῦ τὰ φαινόμενα σύμβολα, 1.1.4). The term φαινόμενα continues this emphasis on appearance. Theatrical terms come into play soon afterwards,

> Καὶ μυρίον εἶδος ὁ δαίμων ἐπὶ μικροῦ τοῦ χωρίου διεσκεύαστο, οἶνον αἵματι μιάνας, καὶ συμποσίοις πόλεμον ἐπιστήσας, φόνους καὶ πότους, σπονδὰς καὶ σφαγὰς ἐπισυνάψας, καὶ τοιοῦτον θέατρον λῃσταῖς Αἰγυπτίοις ἐπιδείξας.
>
> In that small space the deity had contrived a varied spectacle, defiling wine with blood and setting war at a banquet, combining death and drinks, libations and slaughter, and presenting this show for the Egyptian bandits. (1.1.6)

Naturally, this show is not merely for the bandits. The bandits, as mentioned above, are a vehicle through which the audience can view the story from the 'inside'.

[351] Bartsch (1989: 133-143), Dowden (1996: 268-269).

Not only has the scene set before the bandits been described as a piece of theatre, θέατρον, it is a sight that a daimon διεσκεύαστο, a verb with theatre connotations regarding the arrangement or re-arrangement of a text.[352] The scene is presented to the bandits, who are described as spectators— θεωρούς.

> Οἱ γὰρ δὴ κατὰ τὸ ὄρος θεωρούς ἑαυτοὺς τῶνδε καθίσταντες οὐδὲ συνιέναι τὴν σκηνὴν ἐδύναντο…
>
> Those standing on the mountainside, watching these things, unable to comprehend the scene... (1.1.7)

The term θεωρούς has a variety of connotations covering any number of spectacles, from war to theatre to athletic contests to ritual.[353] This reference to standing above watching a performance below may be an allusion to theaters situated on a natural hillside, as in Athens. The presentation of both a 'performance' and an 'audience' gives us an internal scene setting that mirrors the one created by Heliodorus for his reader. In addition, the bandits' surprise and *aporia* give the reader permission to admit astonishment and puzzlement. In fact, they seem to embody the reader's likely interpretative standstill.

The bandits, therefore, serve multiple roles in this initial scene. They are the first characters, or 'actors' in the narrative, described as if costumed. At the sight of plunder below, as Morgan translates, 'they cast themselves as victors and set off down the hillside' (ἑαυτοὺς οὖν νικητὰς ἀποδείξαντες ὥρμησαν, 1.1.8). The participle ἀποδείξαντες, in this instance, has a theatrical tinge— even if translated as 'they appointed themselves victors', the fact that the bandits choose to characterise themselves as victors— something other than they are— gives the moment an additional layer of reflexivity. The actors 'observed' by the reading

[352] Athenaeus, *Table Talk* 1b; Veyne (1989). Dover (1968: lxxxii) discusses the term in reference to revisions of Aristophanes' *Clouds.* See the following chapter.
[353] For example, Theognis 805; Aeschylus, *Prometheus Bound* 118; Plato, *Republic* 467c. Seaford (1996: 233) discusses the connotations of θεωρία.

audience decide to take on a role. They are intentional actors, unlike the spectating Pentheus in the *Bacchae*, who becomes an unwilling part of the maenadic spectacle.[354] Not only are the bandits the first actors, they are the first internal audience in the narrative. Even if we cast the narrator as an observer/form of audience, he takes no place within the story itself. So it is the bandits who serve as the reader's first example audience. Once the narrator brings the picture to the bandits on the hill, the point of view shifts to the bandits, who next serve as the reader's eyes. As the reader's eyes, they give the reader the first baseline for interpretation, and as such serve as a model for reader reaction. But we should not assume a one-to-one correspondence between the reaction or interpretation of bandits and reader. Morgan argues that the bandits serve as a 'naïve' viewer with whom the reader can contrast his own interpretations.[355] Certainly, the bandits, Egyptian-speaking and presumed to be Egyptian, have a different cultural and educational background from the reader of this difficult Greek text. Even as the reader 'sees' through the bandits, when Chariclea speaks, only the reader, not the bandits, understands. This cognitive dissonance begins the separation of reader from bandit, as soon the bandits flee the scene and leave the reader as lone viewer of the following action.

There may be some overlap in these multiple roles, as they are not all particularly distinct, and are clearly not mutually exclusive. Yet the many purposes that one briefly appearing set of characters serves is remarkable and, I believe, significant. Kaimio, in her discussion of internal audiences in Chariton, suggests that the audience appropriates the function of the chorus in tragedy.[356]

[354] Euripides, *Bacchae* 1058ff. For the levels of theatrical self-reflexivity in this famous messenger speech describing Pentheus' demise, see Segal (1982).
[355] Morgan (1991: 88).
[356] Kaimio (1996: 67).

In Heliodorus, the bandits could perhaps be considered the ‘chorus’ of the ‘prologue’ of the novel. In fact, like many Attic tragic choruses, they are very different from their audience. They help set the scene and tone, and integrate the reader into the novel as a viewer. Like the readers, the bandits are outsiders with no particular relationship to the plot and yet are fascinated and perplexed by the scenes set before their eyes.

Conclusion

Chariton, Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus each engage with ideas and techniques associated with live performance, which serve to characterise their novels as, or in competition with, theatrical entertainment. A certain poetics of the novel can be read through the voice of the narrator in Chariton and through the preferences of novel audiences in Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus. The aesthetic they champion appears to be one that regards romantic entertainment as worthwhile for the pleasure it brings an audience. The emphasis on the pleasure to be found in listening to a story or watching a performance seems similar to the pleasure to be found in watching contemporary performance genres like pantomime, whose main draw was the erotically charged plot on display.

In addition to suggesting a poetics of the novel that appears ingrained in contemporary thought about performance, the authors also use theatrical roles and metaphors to conceptualise the formulation of novel plots. Tyche, Aphrodite, Eros and Helios are cast as directors or stage managers, positioning the protagonists across the world stage. As I have shown, these deities can be read as stand-ins for the authors themselves, who are the true powers behind the action and who become rivals to dramatists through the spectacles they devise. Nor are

the authors above commenting on their own skills. The reactions of the internal audiences within the novels imply that the spectacles on display are powerful and moving. These reactions, in turn, encourage the reader to respond emotionally to the scenes they read. Heliodorus' aporetic opening is a far cry from Chariton's omniscient, interjecting narrator, and yet both techniques create a theatrical environment for the reader, in which the reader is invited to become part of a viewing audience.

3. Interactive Audiences and Performers

Introduction

In the previous chapter, I began to discuss the role of audiences within the novel. These internal audiences can act like a tragic chorus, commenting on the action and guiding the responses of the external audience. The variety of the kinds of audiences in the novels, however, means that the role of the audience is not confined to being 'choric'. Audiences can propel the plot and shape the performances—and performers—that they watch. Performers, in turn, can manipulate their audiences. Chariton, Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus each present a variety of characters that perform not only for the readers but also for other characters within the novels. Occasionally these characters are unconscious of their roles as performers, as is frequently the case with Chaereas and Callirhoe, but often they are aware of the presence of spectators and have an agenda behind their performances. In this chapter and the next I will discuss some of the most prominent 'performers' in the novels and their interplay with audiences.

In Chariton, the protagonists are little aware of the potential power they could have over their viewing public. Instead, the pair find themselves more often at the mercy of their audiences than the other way around. In his role as a first-person narrator, Achilles Tatius' Clitophon seems far more aware of his role as storyteller and performer. He frequently comments on the efficacy of storytelling as a means of connecting with and influencing people. The potential give and take between performer and audience is perhaps best on display in Heliodorus. Cnemon is no passive listener to Calasiris' long inset narrative. Instead, he consistently provides feedback regarding the speaker's style and

content, alternately praising Calasiris and encouraging him to speak in more detail, or cover a certain topic. Cnemon, a theatrically minded character, is able to participate in and critique Calasiris' performance. This range of performers and audiences shows the similar and disparate ways in which the novelists engage with the two essential aspects of performance—a person being watched, and a person watching.

Callirhoe and Chaereas: Entertainment for Men and Gods

Like all the novel protagonists, Callirhoe and Chaereas possess great personal beauty, but there is particular emphasis in *Callirhoe* on the protagonists as the object of other characters' gazes. In the very beginning of the work, Chariton describes Callirhoe as a marvel—a visual one, an ἄγαλμα (1.2.1). From her first introduction, Callirhoe's value is presented in terms of the pleasure she offers to a viewer.[357] Chaereas is also presented as an object of viewing, as he is as handsome as an artwork—specifically a statue of Achilles, Nireus or Hippolytus (1.3.2).[358] Initially, Callirhoe and Chaereas are characterised and valued as static works of art. But of course the protagonists are people, not statues, and as they become increasingly active throughout the novel they move away from this characterisation as *objets d'art* and become active participants in livelier spectacles.

Even before her first appearance in public, Callirhoe is so famed for her beauty that a long line of suitors petition for her hand in marriage. At this point, it is merely the rumour of her beauty that attracts her admirers, who wish to

[357] Elsom (1992), Egger (1994: esp. 36-37), Zeitlin (2003: 79).
[358] Zeitlin (2003: 79). Achilles and Nireus link the text with the *Iliad*, but the mention of Hippolytus could have theatrical connotations from tragedy and pantomime.

possess this ἄγαλμα.[359] Callirhoe's famed beauty and many suitors bring to mind Helen of Troy. Katharine Haynes observes that Callirhoe frequently recalls Euripides' *Helen*.[360] However, the character of 'Helen' was not the sole property of tragedy, featuring in other literature such as Homeric epic, as well as subliterary performance such as pantomime.[361] While Callirhoe has her coterie of suitors, Chaereas has his own following among the citizens of Syracuse, particularly the members of the gymnasium. It would appear that the protagonists gain their admirers solely due to their external qualities, as both are described almost entirely in terms of their noble birth and beauty.[362]

The protagonists' passivity and tendency to serve as entertainment for others is further highlighted by the manner in which they fall in love. Callirhoe may have numerous suitors, but Eros devises his own match (1.1.2). The god decides to manipulate the pair, so that they might see each other (ἵνα ἑκάτερος τῷ ἑτέρῳ ὀφθῇ, 1.1.6).[363] The apparently chance encounter is orchestrated and directed by Eros and results in the pair falling in love at first sight.[364] Chaereas and Callirhoe are from rival political families and a marriage alliance is unlikely. Both young people pine for each other, to the point that Chaereas becomes too unwell to participate in public life. He stops going to the gymnasium. So, apparently, does everyone else (1.1.10). It seems that Chaereas was more of an attraction than the facilities. Chaereas may in fact be essential to the proper functioning of civic life, since his person attracts a crowd at the right places.

[359] Schmeling (2005: 37 n 1) lists mentions of Callirhoe's beauty.
[360] Laplace (1980), Egger (1994: 42), Haynes (2003: 48).
[361] Lucian, *De Salt.* 40, 46; Apuleius, *Met.* 10.30-34.
[362] For an exploration of Callirhoe as an object or erotic subject, see Elsom (1992).
[363] See chapter two.
[364] See the previous chapter for a discussion of Eros and Tyche as dramatists.

The citizens of Syracuse, deprived of the sight of their beloved Chaereas, fear he will die. At a regular assembly (νόμιμος ἐκκλησία) the Syracusans beg Hermocrates, father of Callirhoe, to consent to the marriage in order to save Chaereas' life. Under the pressure of the crowd, an audience awaiting their response, the politician agrees (1.1.11). Chariton asks, 'who could describe that assembly, at which Eros was the demagogue?' (τίς ἂν μηνύσειε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐκείνην, ἧς ὁ Ἔρως ἦν δημαγωγός; 1.12.2). The marriage of Chaereas and Callirhoe, an event integral to the narrative, comes about not through the actions of two young people in love, but rather through the machinations of Eros and the Syracusans' interest in Chaereas. The assembly happens to take place in a theatre (1.12.2). Although it is likely that public assemblies in Chariton's time usually took place in a theatre,[365] it is no accident that the author makes this circumstance explicit.[366] The assembly's only item on the agenda is the citizens' petition for the marriage in order to preserve one of their favourite forms of entertainment—watching Chaereas. Callirhoe and Chaereas are so removed from the action of determining their futures that they are not even present. Their fate is decided for them, and for the entertainment and enjoyment of the city. Their relationship is important enough to require citizen intervention in a public assembly, and their marriage becomes public business and public pleasure.

While the young men of the town run to tell Chaereas he is getting married, the women go to prepare Callirhoe. The entire city becomes the setting of the wedding. The marriage hymn resounds through the city, the streets are filled with garlands and torches, the doorways are sprinkled with wine and perfume (1.1.13). Callirhoe and Chaereas serve as little more than beautiful

[365] Kolb (1981: 88-89), Roueché (1993: 102-103).
[366] Tilg (2010: 139).

puppets in a show devised by the Syracusan citizens. Callirhoe is not even told whom it is that she is about to marry. Nonetheless, she is dressed by her maids as a bride and has little choice but to participate in the public marriage ceremony, whoever the husband turns out to be. Callirhoe passively complies. To her great joy and relief, her groom turns out to be the man she loves. However, her obedience in preparing for her wedding reveals that she would have played the bride to whomsoever her family chose. Callirhoe's happiness makes her become an even more beautiful sight when Chaereas is revealed as her husband-to-be, so much so that when she steps out of her house the crowd marvels at her (ἐθαύμαζον, 1.1.16).

The citizens' amazement at Callirhoe's beauty is but the first of many instances in which her appearance has a dramatic effect on those who see her.[367] As the novel progresses, Callirhoe attracts enormous admiring crowds wherever she goes.[368] She is a celebrity not unlike a famous sophist or pantomime dancer, whose mere appearance can mesmerise a crowd. According to Philostratus, whenever it was announced that the sophist Adrian of Tyre was about to declaim, audiences would leave the shows they were watching and run to see the declaimer. [369] Even when she is assumed dead, her funeral becomes a huge public event. Chariton prefaces the *ekphrasis* with a rhetorical question: 'Who would be able to fittingly describe that funeral?' (τίς ἂν οὖν ἀπαγγεῖλαι δύναιτο κατ'ἀξίαν τὴν ἐκκομιδὴν ἐκείνην, 1.6.2). The answer, naturally, is himself. Callirhoe is dressed in her bridal gown and likened to a sleeping Ariadne (1.6.2). The comparison of Callirhoe to Ariadne could have pantomime connotations, as

[367] Haynes (2003: 47), Schmeling (2005: 43-44).
[368] Elsom (1992), Egger (1994), Zeitlin (2003), Schmeling (2005: 41).
[369] Philostratus, *VS* 589.

the story was the subject of pantomime performance.[370] Her bier is followed by Syracusan cavalry and infantry carrying war trophies, by her father, who is accompanied by men who seem like bodyguards, by weeping women, and by an abundance of treasure from the spoils of war (1.6.3-4). Hermocrates builds a magnificent tomb by the shore, 'visible' to people sailing far off (περίβλεπτος, 1.6.5). The *ekphrasis* of the funeral procession reveals the nature of the funeral as a spectacle. Her funeral serves as a demonstration of Hermocrates' wealth and power as well as Chaereas and Callirhoe's value to the city.[371] As with the wedding, the entire *polis* takes part in the spectacle of Callirhoe's entombment—as before, the male citizens have a specific role, as do their wives. The only difference is that where the previous event was characterised by its joy, this one is characterised by an equally strong but opposite emotion: grief. When Callirhoe marries for a second time, her second wedding ceremony has as many eager spectators as the first. The surrounding area is so crowded that people climb onto the rooftops to see (3.2.17). Callirhoe is the spectacle that gathers such a crowd: 'however, there was one desire of all: to see Callirhoe' (μία δὲ πάντων ἦν ἐπιθυμία Καλλιρόην θεάσασθαι, 3.2.16). Callirhoe's beauty turns her into a famous attraction, so that even the Persian King hears she is more beautiful than Ariadne or Leda (4.1.8). Her beauty competes with the gods, but the attention she receives places her on par with mortal performers.[372]

When her second husband encourages Callirhoe to hold a funeral for Chaereas, once again she is on display. She gives a brief speech and the crowd bursts into tears, pitying Chaereas not for being dead, but for being without Callirhoe (4.1.12). When Callirhoe travels to the Persian court for Dionysius'

[370] Lucian, *De Salt.* 49.
[371] Elsom (1992: 226).
[372] Schmeling (2005).

trial against Mithridates, her fame precedes her: 'Entire cities came out and those running to see the sight crowded the streets' (πόλεις ἀπήντων ὅλαι καὶ τὰς ὁδοὺς ἐστενοχώρουν οἱ συντρέχοντες ἐπὶ τὴν θέαν, 4.7.6).

Upon reaching Babylon, she again takes part in a spectacle arranged by others: a public beauty contest. The women of Persia had decided that the most beautiful Persian woman should arrange to stand near Callirhoe and eclipse the foreigner's beauty. They vote as if in a theatre (χειροτονία δὲ ἦν ὡς ἐν θεάτρῳ, 5.3.4) and choose a famous beauty named Rhodogune. The women 'carefully groomed her for the contest' (εἰς τὸν ἀγῶνα καλῶς αὐτὴν κατεσκεύασαν, 5.3.5), dressing her and giving her their own ornaments (5.3.4). Once again, there is a great crowd awaiting the spectacle (τὴν θέαν, 5.3.5). Rhodogune is situated most conspicuously (περιφανεστάτῳ, 5.3.6). As Callirhoe steps out of the carriage:

> ἅμα δὲ πάντες οὐ μόνον τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς ἐξέτειναν καὶ μικροῦ δεῖν ἐπ᾽ ἀλλήλους κατέπεσον, ἄλλος πρὸ ἄλλου θέλων ἰδεῖν καὶ ὡς δυνατὸν ἐγγυτάτω γενέσθαι.
>
> at that moment everyone strained not only their eyes but their very souls, and nearly fell over each other, one wishing to see before the other and be as near as possible (5.3.8)

The citizens jostle each other like spectators in a theatre, each trying to get closest to the sights onstage.[373] When Callirhoe appears, the crowds are wonderstruck (ἐκπλαγέντες, 5.3.9) and kneel before Callirhoe (προσεκύνησαν, 5.3.9), completely ignoring Rhodogune. Like Aphrodite, Callirhoe is associated with a beauty contest, and like Helen, Callirhoe is also considered a prize.[374] This famous story could be found in literature and on the stage.[375]

[373] Philostratus, *VS* 589. John Chrysostom writes, derisively, of the crowds who hurry to the theatre, *Hom. In. Matt*. (*PG* 57.426), *De Anna* 4.1 (*PG* 57.660).
[374] Schmeling (2005: 47).
[375] The pantomime in Apuleius, *Met.* 10 re-enacts the judgment of Paris, as mentioned in chapter two.

Chariton takes care to call the citizens of Babylon 'barbarians' at this moment (βάρβαροι, 5.3.9), emphasising Greek superiority. The Persians perform *proskynesis* to honour Callirhoe, bowing, as it were, to the power of Greece. The crowd's reaction also brings to mind the stereotype that barbarians are less sophisticated than Greeks and less accustomed to theatrical spectacle. The sophist Eunapius of Sardis tells of a *tragoidos* from the time of Nero who went to a barbarian city and whose audience fled in terror of his mask and attire. After he explained his costume, he put on a performance that overpowered (κατακρατέω) his audience even though they did not understand his speech or the story being told.[376] Eunapius' story is very similar to one in Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius*, in which a tragedian travels to Spain and terrifies spectators unfamiliar with theatrical conventions, as well as one in Lucian's *How to Write History*, this time set in Abdera.[377] This collection of anecdotes suggests a certain theme: the contrast between the educated and theatrically aware Greek élite, and the ignorant and theatrically unversed barbarians. The Babylonians, like the barbarians in Eunapius, Philostratus and Lucian, are overwhelmed by the sight of a Greek, Callirhoe. Although Callirhoe is adorned with her beauty, not with tragic attire, the same cultural supremacy implied in the anecdotes is on display.

Although Callirhoe is usually an unwilling or accidental performer, she is capable of performing on purpose. Her second marriage is one of expedience, but it is her choice of expedients. She is pregnant with Chaereas' child, far from home and a slave in service to Dionysius, who is in love with her. Rather than bear and raise her child in slavery, she agrees to marry Dionysius.[378] With the

[376] Eunapius, fr. 54 *Historici graeci minores*; cf. Easterling (1997: 222-223), Easterling and Miles (1999: 99-100).
[377] Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius* 5.9, Lucian, *How to Write History* 1.
[378] Chariton 2.8.4-3.1.5.

encouragement of the slave Plangon, she conceals her pregnancy and will later present the child as the son of Dionysius.[379] Before her wedding to Dionysius, Callirhoe prays to Aphrodite, 'allow my scheme to be hidden' (ποίησόν μου λαθεῖν τὴν τέχνην, 3.2.13). Although Callirhoe has been forced by Tyche (2.7.3) to make a difficult choice, it is ultimately her own decision to get married. Where previously Callirhoe had fainted at the sight of her future husband Chaereas, it is Dionysius who faints at the news that Callirhoe is willing to marry him (3.1.3). In her first wedding, Callirhoe was a passive object of view, a puppet strung along by Eros and the Syracusans. Although the gods (in this case, fate) do not leave Callirhoe completely to her own devices, the second wedding becomes one of the few moments in the novel when Callirhoe has agency of her own and actively chooses her future. She consciously plays the role of happy bride, in another large public ceremony. As her prayer to Aphrodite shows, Callirhoe is well aware of the playacting ahead of her.

Achilles Tatius

Perhaps the most intriguing relationship in Achilles Tatius is the one between the two protagonists. Their short courtship contains performances by both parties. Clitophon's first-person narration means that Leucippe is shown through the interpretative lens of her lover.[380] In the first chapter I briefly discussed the way that Clitophon is an audience to Leucippe. When Clitophon tries to woo her, he becomes the performer. After her arrival, Clitophon walks about the house appearing to read a book, all the while taking every opportunity he can to gaze on Leucippe (1.6.6). A few days later, he makes a speech to his

[379] Egger (1994: 41) calls this 'a cunning scheme reminiscent of New Comedy'.
[380] For further on the narrative gymnastics of Achilles Tatius see Hägg (1971), Reardon (1994), Morales (2004), Repath (2005).

servant Satyrus within earshot of Leucippe, who is the intended audience. Clitophon claims Satyrus assisted in the performance by continuing the conversation (1.17.1). Later, Clitophon pretends to be stung on the lip by a bee so that Leucippe will say a charm over it. He uses the opportunity to kiss her (2.7.4). His performances are part of a deeper game to impress Leucippe or press his desires upon her.[381]

Near the end of the novel, when Clitophon recites his and Leucippe's adventures, he shows his awareness of how a performance should be tailored to its audience.[382] He claims 'I exalted my doings, altering them to emphasise my continence but I told no lie' (ἐξῆρον τὸ πρᾶγμα ἐμαυτοῦ πρὸς σωφροσύνην μεταποιῶν καὶ οὐδὲν ἐψευδόμην, 8.5.2). He chooses to omit the part of his δράματα, 'adventures', where he had sexual relations with the 'widow' Melite. When it comes to telling Leucippe's side of the story, he claims 'I made more of her adventures than mine since I was amorously ingratiating myself with her while her father was listening' (ἐξῆρον καὶ τὰ αὐτῆς ἔτι μᾶλλον ἢ τἀμά ἐρωτικῶς αὐτῇ χαριούμενος ἀκούοντος τοῦ πατρός, 8.5.5). Clitophon is very aware of his audience and tailors his story appropriately, minimising (or omitting) his adventures and emphasising those of his lover. His story is effective; the priest 'is amazed' (θαυμάζων) and Sostratus weeps to hear tell of Leucippe's suffering (8.5.9). Greek literature's most famous inset storyteller, Odysseus, uses his performances for similar effect—obtaining admiration, aid and material reward from the Phaeacians, even establishing credit with his own wife.[383] Similarly, Neoptolemus uses a combination of truth and lies to gain the trust of Philoctetes

[381] Laplace (2007: 625-641) sees the scenes of illicit unions and romance as relating to New Comedy. See also Crismani (1997).
[382] Whitmarsh (2011: 91-93).
[383] Homer, *Odyssey* 9.1-13.440, 19.106-305. Whitmarsh (2011: 93) points to Odyssey's self-censorship regarding Circe at *Odyssey* 23.321.

in Sophocles' tragedy.[384] Clitophon falls well within the tradition of self-conscious performers who manipulate their audience for their own purposes.

While Leucippe is imprisoned, she voices a monologue in which she seems aware of the theatricality of her situation—particularly the fact that she is living under an assumed identity. She laments,

> ἆρα ἀποκαλύψασα τοῦ δράματος τὴν ὑπόκρισιν διηγήσομαι τὴν ἀλήθειαν; … οὐ καλοῦμαι Λάκαινα. ὕβρις αὕτη ἐστὶ πειρατική· λελῄστευμαι καὶ τοὔνομα… φέρε πάλιν ἐνδύσωμαί μου τὸ δρᾶμα· φέρε πάλιν περίθωμαι τὴν Λάκαιναν.
>
> Should I tell the truth and unmask the actor of this drama… I am not called Lacaena: this is another piratical insult; I have had even my name stolen from me…[385] Come, I will again immerse myself in this drama: let me again assume [the character of] Lacaena! (6.16.4-6)

It appears the pirates who put her in the costume of another woman also provided her with her false name. Leucippe refers to a δρᾶμα and to acting as one other than herself. She speaks as if she were an actor contemplating the reality of 'self' and 'role' (ὑπόκρισις). Like an actor, she has the choice to immerse, even lose, herself in a role, and to let fiction spill into everyday life. There is a 'backstage' element to her deliberation that recalls contemporary artistic renderings of actors rehearsing.[386] Although the initial set-up of her identity was without her consent, Leucippe chooses to continue 'playing' the role of Lacaena even after Clitophon arrives.

Although Leucippe is unaware of the fact, her monologue has an audience. Thersander and Sosthenes are listening on the other side of the door (6.15.4), and Thersander is particular is especially affected by the spectacle of Leucippe—when he enters the room the sight of her inflames his heart (ἀνεφλέγη

[384] Sophocles, *Philoctetes* 55-85, 240-390.
[385] Odysseus at least allows Neoptolemus to keep his own name when deceiving Philoctetes (Sophocles, *Philoctetes* 57). Leucippe loses her identity in 'Lacaena'.
[386] Bergmann (1999: 27).

τὴν ψυχήν, 6.18.1).[387] His amorous response resembles that of a viewer of pantomime in the theatre.[388] Before he confronts Leucippe, Thersander takes a moment, 'composing himself into an expression more acceptable to her sight' (σχηματίσας ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὸ εὐαγωγότερον πρὸς θέαν, 6.18.1). The word σχηματίσας has clear stage connotations, particularly in terms of the shapes and figures of a dance, such as pantomime.[389]

Calasiris as Storyteller and Cnemon as Audience

The Egyptian priest Calasiris' lengthy inset narrative is as famous and unique to Heliodorus as his novel's famous aporetic opening. J.J. Winkler, John Morgan, Ken Dowden and others have each examined Calasiris and his contradictions.[390] Morgan claims 'the performance of Calasiris is in many ways emblematic of the whole novel, intensely self-aware, theatrical, manipulative, enigmatic.'[391] I will not linger on Calasiris' mendacity or truth but instead will highlight aspects of the theatricality of his narrative, hoping to shed additional light on a subject that other scholars have begun to investigate.[392] Winkler presents Calasiris' story as a more sophisticated, 'Heliodoran' alternative to the

[387] Laplace (2007: 692-693, 718) marks how Leucippe's theatrics affect Thersander's emotions.
[388] Columella, *On Agriculture* 1.15; Minucius Felix, *Octavius* 37.12.
[389] Plutarch, *Moralia* 474c includes σχῆμα as one of the three elements of dancing. See also Libanius, *Or*. 64. 28, 'come, then, wouldn't you say that dancing is the vigorous motion of the limbs in keeping with certain figures and rhythms?', (φέρε γὰρ, οὐ κίνησιν τῶν μελῶν σύντονον μετά τινων σχημάτων καὶ ῥυθμῶν τὴν ὄρχησιν εἶναι λέγεις;) and *Or*. 64.88, 'we ask only that the voice support the movements' (τοσοῦτον δὲ ἀπαιτοῦμεν μόνον, ὑπηρετῆσαι τὴν φωνὴν τοῖς σχήμασιν). For earlier periods, cf. Aristotle, *Poetics* 1447a 26-28, where the art of dancing is based 'on rhythm alone' (αὐτῷ δὲ τῷ ῥυθμῷ), 'for these too [sc. the dancers] imitate character, emotions and actions through rhythm translated into movements' (καὶ γὰρ οὗτοι διὰ τῶν σχηματιζομένων ῥυθμῶν μιμοῦνται καὶ ἤθη καὶ πάθη καὶ πράξεις) and Plato, *Leg.* 816a, 'therefore the advent of the imitation of words through movement produced the entire art of dancing', (διὸ μίμησις τῶν λεγομένων σχήμασι γενομένη τὴν ὀρχηστικὴν ἐξηργάσατο τέχνην σύμπασαν).
[390] Winkler (1982), Sandy (1982), Morgan (1989a) and (1994), Futre Pinheiro (1992), Dowden (1996).
[391] Morgan (1994: 108).
[392] Walden (1894), Winkler (1982), Bartsch (1989), Paulsen (1992), Morgan (1992), Winkler (2001).

Athenian Cnemon's earlier, shorter narrative.[393] The invitation to compare the tales is implicit, as Cnemon is the internal, appreciative, audience to Calasiris' tale. It is the previous storyteller who urges Calasiris to begin, continue and elaborate. His exhortations and eagerness fit comfortably with his depiction as a character with a taste for the theatre.[394] Of course he would like to witness a performance. His language and Calasiris' responses to it act as preamble to Calasiris' story. The dialogue brings the ideas of theatre to the fore, priming the reading audience for an experience akin to performance, tragic or otherwise.

When Cnemon first asks Calasiris to tell him all he knows about Chariclea and Theagenes, Calasiris defers, suggesting they dine first, 'for a longer task awaits—for you the listening to the tale, and for me the telling of it' (μακροτέρας γὰρ δεήσει σοί τε τῆς ἀκροάσεως ἐμοί τε τῆς ἀφηγήσεως, 2.23.4). With the mention of the need for sustenance, Calasiris places an emphasis on the physical demands of being a listener and being a speaker. He is aware of the effort required for both a discerning audience and an actor, and makes the reading audience aware of it as well. In fact, Calasiris' diet is similar to an actor or orator, in that he abstains from alcohol and eats very little.[395] In addition, by putting off the telling of the tale, he increases his (internal and external) audience's interest in it. Calasiris uses the tactic of prolongation to increase anticipation for the story he tells; Cnemon's earlier narrative, on the other hand, served as a prolongation before the reader learned more about the protagonists.[396]

The text's dialogic partner here seems to be a frame of reference which intersects with performance, particularly the literary tradition regarding a 'feast

[393] Winkler (1982: 94, 107).
[394] According to Garson (1975: 138) Cnemon has a 'mildly humourous obsession…with the stage'.
[395] Aristophanes, *Knights* 347-349; Plato, *Laws* 2.665e8. See also Hall (2002: 24).
[396] Winkler (1982: 103), Morgan (1989: 103).

of words': literature so rich and varied that it can stand in place of an elaborate banquet, with the discourse arranged as if it were the many courses of a dinner. As Emily Gowers notes, 'The Greeks and Romans could describe the whole process of creating, presenting, and consuming a literary text in alimentary terms.' [397] The epitomator of Athenaeus' text plays with the motif at the beginning of *Deipnosophistae*:

> ἐστιν ἡ τοῦ λόγου οἰκονομία μίμημα τῆς τοῦ δείπνου πολυτελείας καὶ ἡ τῆς βίβλου διασκευὴ τῆς ἐν τῷ δείπνῳ παρασκευῆς. τοιοῦτον ὁ θαυμαστὸς οὗτος τοῦ λόγου οἰκονόμος Ἀθήναιος ἥδιστον λογόδειπνον εἰσηγεῖται…
>
> The arrangement of the discourse mimics the extravagance of a feast, and the arrangement of the book, the preparation of a dinner. Such is the pleasing feast of reason which this wonderful steward, Athenaeus, introduces ...[398]

Similar 'feast of words' metaphors can be found in the tragic and comic tradition. In Aristophanes the art of comedy is presented as μέγα τι βρῶμα, 'a substantial meal'.[399] Lada-Richards has argued with respect to Aristophanes' *Frogs* that the audience might have been able to assimilate the literary debate of the agon to an intellectual banquet.[400] There is a similar depiction regarding tragedy in a fragment from Astydamas II:

> ἀλλ᾽ ὥσπερ δείπνου γλαφυροῦ ποικίλην εὐωχίαν
> τὸν ποιητὴν δεῖ παρέχειν τοῖς θεαταῖς τὸν σοφόν,
> ἵν᾽ ἀπίῃ τις τοῦτο φαγὼν καὶ πιών, ὅπερ λαβών
> χαίρει <τις>…
>
> Like the varied feast of an elegant dinner,
> such must be provided by the clever poet for the spectators,
> so that each departs after having eaten and drunk,

[397] Gowers (1993: 41).
[398] Epitomator of Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 1b.
[399] Aristophanes, fr 347, 1 K-A. Other examples include Aristophanes discussing rival poets; καὶ πῶς ἐγὼ Σθενέλου φάγοιμ᾽ ἂν ῥήματα, 'and how I would eat Sthenelos' words' (Aristophanes, fr 158 K-A); ὅς ἀπὸ σμικρᾶς δαπάνης ὑμᾶς ἀριστίζων ἀπέπεμπεν, '[Crates] gave you a poor breakfast' (Knights 538-9). Metagenes hopes ὡς ἂν καιναῖσι παροψίσι εὐωχήσω τὸ θέατρον, 'to delight the audience with a feast of side-dishes, new and many' (Metagenes, fr 15 K-A).
[400] Lada-Richards (1999: 137-156).

that which pleases him…[401]

A sophisticated audience may expect at this moment a metaphorical meal, such as the one Cnemon is keen to enjoy. Calasiris is a seasoned performer and Cnemon a seasoned spectator with, it appears, a taste for the high-brow.[402] The scene is set for a traditional feast of words, but instead, Calasiris proffers a literal feast. The substitution of literal for metaphorical may be an educated joke, a subversion of a cultivated reader's expectations.

Cnemon drinks wine as they eat, while Calasiris, an ascetic, chooses water. With wine at hand, Cnemon addresses Calasiris.

> «Ὁ Διόνυσος», εἶπεν «οἶσθα ὦ πάτερ ὡς χαίρει μύθοις καὶ κωμῳδίας φιλεῖ· κἀμὲ δὴ οὖν τὰ νῦν εἰσῳκισμένος ἀνίησι πρὸς τὴν ἀκρόασιν τόν τε ἐπηγγελμένον πρὸς σοῦ μισθὸν ἀπαιτεῖν ἐπείγει, καὶ ὥρα σοι τὸ δρᾶμα καθάπερ ἐπὶ σκηνῆς τῷ λόγῳ διασκευάζειν»
>
> He said, 'you know, Father, how Dionysus enjoys stories and likes entertainment. Now he, having taken up residence in me, puts me in the mood for listening; and to demand you to make the payment you promised. It is time for you to arrange your drama in words as if on the stage.' (2.23.5)

The term διασκευάζειν can mean to 'arrange' or 'prepare' objects, but also to 'revise' or 'edit' texts, even to 'elaborate with rhetorical devices', or, as Gerald Sandy interprets it, 'present elaborately'.[403] The noun διασκευή could mean a rhetorical elaboration, a new edition or recension of a work or a theatrical performance. It is the same noun the epitomator of Athenaeus' text uses to describe the 'organisation' of his book and is related to the σκευασία, the 'preparing' or 'dressing' mentioned in Astydamas II. Hypothesis I of Aristophanes' second version of *Clouds* refers to how the play 'has been revised

[401] *TGrF* i (60) F4.
[402] See chapter eight for further on Cnemon's focus on tragedy.
[403] Sandy (1982a: 27).

in part' (διεσκεύασται ἐπὶ μέρους).[404] Cnemon's exhortation comes during the literal feast, but may recall language used in discourse on metaphorical feasts. In addition, the mention of a drama set on the σκηνή can bring to mind any number of theatrical connotations.[405] Perhaps Cnemon is inviting Calasiris to revise and elaborate his story as if he were a declaimer or even a drama troupe-leader or protagonist, who could adapt dramatic texts at will.[406] Eating, drinking and telling stories fall within the context of a *symposion*. The dramatic connection is not only effected by means of Dionysus. Since archaic times the *symposion* was a privileged forum for the creation and recital of poetry, including dramatic arias in the fifth century.[407] Closer to Heliodorus' time, plays or extracts were performed at banquets, or particularly histrionic extracts such as the return of the mad Agave from the mountains with the head of Pentheus.[408]

Cnemon's earlier naming of Dionysus brings in the god's association with Attic dramatic festivals. Perhaps, for the reader, an allusion to dramatic festivals— which featured dramatic contests— could suggest an implicit competition between Cnemon's and Calasiris' narrative. Again Calasiris puts off telling his story, this time adding how he has meant to tell it to their host, Nausikles, but has always found excuses to postpone it (2.23.6). But Cnemon has had enough, exclaiming,

> ἔλαθες γάρ με μικροῦ καὶ εἰς πέρας τῷ λόγῳ διαβιβάζων, ἐπεισόδιον δὴ τοῦτο οὐδέν φασι πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον ἐπεισκυκλήσας ὥστε ἐπάναγε τὸν λόγον πρὸς τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν

[404] Dover (1968: lxxxii).
[405] Walden (1894: 6-8) discusses the use of δρᾶμα and its theatrical connotations.
[406] See chapter two.
[407] For further discussion of *symposia*, see Bowie (1986) and (1990b: 221-229), and Athanassaki and Bowie (2011).
[408] Plutarch, *Moralia* 712a, suggests that it is easier to have a *symposion* without wine than without Menander.

> You nearly got away with carrying me straight to the ending of the story with your talk, rolling in this subplot which, as they say, has nothing to do with Dionysus, so take your story back to your promise. (2.24.4)

Morgan explains that the term 'nothing to do with Dionysus' is a proverbial phrase meaning 'not to the point'.[409] With Cnemon's previous mention of the god, the phrase takes on additional meaning. He also uses a term that appears to be related to the stage-term ἐκκυκλέω, which means to roll something onstage using a wheeled platform, the ἐκκύκλημα. The word ἐπεισόδιον also has theatrical connotations.[410] Dionysus, referred to in the same sentence, takes the reader to the realm of theatre and stagecraft. Cnemon characterises Calasiris as a stage-manager or stage-hand, in control of the action 'onstage', who in this case is trying to change the subject of the performance to something that has 'nothing to do with Dionysus'— or rather, nothing to do with the performance Cnemon wishes to experience. Cnemon continues,

> εὕρηκα γάρ σε κατὰ τὸν Πρωτέα τὸν Φάριον, οὐ κατ᾽ αὐτὸν τρεπόμενον εἰς ψευδομένην καὶ ῥέουσαν ὄψιν ἀλλά με παραφέρειν πειρώμενον,
>
> For I have found you just like Proteus of Pharos, not that you like him turn into false and shifting appearances, but you are trying to mislead me! (2.24.4)

Proteus, the shape-shifting sea god, is wrestled to the ground by Menelaus in the *Odyssey* (4.383ff.) and forced to reveal his secrets. Like Proteus, Calasiris is hard to pin down, but Cnemon will (verbally) wrestle to learn his story. The *Aethiopica* contains many Homeric allusions and parallels, so a simple Homeric allusion would not be out of place. However, with the double meaning to the Dionysus phrase and the use of ἐκκυκλέω, it is tempting to see in the reference to

[409] Morgan (1989a: 398 n 54).
[410] Gilbert (1949: 56-64), Nickau (1966), Friedrich (1983: 34-52).

Proteus, who was often associated with the lithe and versatile dancers of pantomime,[411] a nod to the Protean nature of performers like Calasiris. Plato's *Ion* offers an early association of the imitative performer in general with Proteus:

> ὥσπερ ὁ Πρωτεὺς παντοδαπὸς γίγνει στρεφόμενος ἀνεφάνης, ἵνα μὴ ἐπιδείξῃς ὡς δεινὸς εἶ τὴν περὶ Ὁμήρου σοφίαν,
>
> You are like Proteus becoming every shape, twisting and displaying yourself so that you don't display how formidable you are regarding Homeric lore.[412]

The idea of Calasiris as a Proteus could stay with the reader as his following story provides ample evidence of his ability to change his self-presentation to suit each situation he faces. Although Calasiris' corporeal form never changes, his claims about himself and his motives appear to shift dizzyingly, as his story shows.

Proteus is also the subject of the opening invocation of Nonnus' *Dionysiaca*, a poem indebted to the pantomime aesthetic. In Nonnus, the Protean shape-shiftings concern linguistic tropes, similar to the manner in which Calasiris appears to be a Proteus to Cnemon.

> ἀλλὰ χοροῦ ψαύοντι Φάρῳ παρὰ γείτονι νήσῳ
> στήσατέ μοι Πρωτῆα πολύτροπον, ὄφρα φανείη
> ποικίλον εἶδος ἔχων, ὅτι ποικίλον ὕμνον ἀράσσω.
> εἰ γὰρ ἐφερπύσσειε δράκων κυκλούμενος ὁλκῷ,
> μέλψω θεῖον ἄεθλον, ὅπῃ κισσώδεϊ θύρσῳ
> φρικτὰ δρακοντοκόμων ἐδαΐζετο φῦλα Γιγάντων·
> εἰ δὲ λέων φρίξειεν ἐπαυχενίην τρίχα σείων,
> Βάκχον ἀνευάξω βλοσυρῆς ἐπὶ πήχεϊ Ῥείης
> μαζὸν ὑποκλέπτοντα λεοντοβότοιο θεαίνης·

[411] Lucian, *De Salt* 19, 'for it seems to me that the ancient myth about Proteus the Egyptian means nothing else that he was a dancer, an imitative fellow, able to shape himself and change himself into anything', (δοκεῖ γάρ μοι ὁ παλαιὸς μῦθος καὶ Πρωτέα τὸν Αἰγύπτιον οὐκ ἄλλο τι ἢ ὀρχηστήν τινα γενέσθαι λέγειν, μιμητικὸν ἄνθρωπον καὶ πρὸς πάντα σχηματίζεσθαι καὶ μεταβάλλεσθαι δυνάμενον). See also Libanius, *Or*. 64. 117 in which pantomime is said to be like Proteus; and Aristaenetus's fictional letter (*Ep*. 1.26) to the female pantomime Panarete, in which she too is called a Proteus for her versatility.

[412] Plato, *Ion* 541e7-8.

> But bring me Proteus of many turns a partner in your dance in the nearby neighbouring island of Pharos, that he may appear in his diverse shapes since I play a diverse hymn. For if he glides as a snake, winding trail, I will sing the divine achievement of how with the ivy-twined thyrsus he destroyed the terrible hosts of serpent-haired Giants. If as a lion he shakes his bristling mane, I will cry out to Bacchus on the arm of buxom Rheia, sneakily draining the breast of the lionbreeding goddess.[413]

The reference to Proteus in the proem suggests that Nonnus intends to make a statement regarding his work's poetics—the poem will be Protean in its style, diverse and flexible.[414] Other authors also align 'Proteus's somatic flexibility with literary and stylistic versatility'.[415] Dionysius of Halicarnassus compares the élite orator to Proteus and Choricius transfers Protean versatility to the sophist's tongue.[416] Calasiris then is 'Protean' like a performer, silver-tongued and quick-witted, leading his audience on a string. His self-identification as a performer/dramatist who will take care in the presentation of his work is further underlined by his response to Cnemon. He promises he is not playing the sophist (σοφιστεύων) but presenting (παρασκευάζων) his tale is a well-ordered fashion (2.24.5).[417] In bringing sophistry to mind, Calasiris invites the comparison more than he dismisses it.[418] His carefully arranged performance and delivery are not dissimilar to the pieces delivered by declaimers. The verb παρασκευάζειν brings to mind Cnemon's use of διασκευάζειν (2.23.5).[419] Cnemon uses the language of sophisticated performance and Calasiris responds in kind.

The opening dialogue between Cnemon and Calasiris sets up Calasiris' story as a 'theatrical' entertainment, with the Egyptian as entertainer and the

[413] Nonnus, *Dionysiaca* 1.13-21.
[414] Shorrock (2001: 21). For further discussion of Protean stylistics see Schlapbach (2008).
[415] Lada-Richards (2013: 133 n 87).
[416] Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Demosthenes* 8; Choricius, *Or*. 34.5; cf. Lada-Richards (2007: 208 n 20).
[417] Hefti (1950: 137).
[418] Futre Pinheiro (1992: 74-75).
[419] Sandy (1982a: 27).

Athenian as audience. In response to Cnemon's entreaties for specificity, Calasiris exclaims that his interest in incidental spectacle (ἐκ παρόδου θεωρός) confirms that he really is Athenian (3.1.2). Calasiris equates Cnemon's theatrical interest with his origins.[420] His status as an Athenian theatregoer naturally suggests a familiarity with tragedy, but it could also be an acknowledgement of particularly sophisticated spectating, rather than an 'Athenian lust for the spectacular'.[421] Athens' reputation was not built on tragedy alone. It was also an acknowledged centre of sophistic rhetoric and the home of writers and orators like Lysias. This characterization as a discerning listener continues throughout his tale, through his interjections. A recounting of the temple of Delphi receives the praise, 'you speak excellently' (ἄριστα…λέγεις, 2.26.3), because Calasiris' depiction agrees with what Cnemon's father had told him about the sanctuary. Cnemon is an appreciative but also an appraising audience.[422] His judgment of Calasiris' description is based on other descriptions/*ekphraseis* he has heard; and his enjoyment is partly based on this previous experience as a listener. In short, he is as discerning as an experienced theatre-goer, who compares the performances he has seen.

Cnemon's role as a vocal and discerning audience continues. When Calasiris mentions the completion of a religious ceremony in which both Chariclea and Theagenes took part, he requests a more complete description.

---

[420] Winker (1982: 145), Hardie (1998: 24). Cnemon's Athenian identity will be discussed further in chapter eight. See also Morgan (1989b), Oudot (1992).

[421] Winker (1982: 145). Dowden (1996: 283) 'Cnemon would rather goggle at theatrical spectacle than understand'.

[422] Hunter (1998: 50) suggests that this does not necessarily mean Cnemon is a discerning reader—a description that sounds just like one delivered by someone else may simply be full of commonplaces. Whether one agrees with this or not, the important part of Cnemon's judgment of the description is the fact that he is judging, and that judging is part of his enjoyment. Even if Cnemon is not the 'perfect' reader/audience, he is an experienced audience member with fixed opinions and tastes.

> ἐμὲ γοῦν οὔπω θεατὴν ὁ σὸς ἐπέστησε λόγος ἀλλ᾽ εἰς πᾶσαν ὑπερβολὴν ἠττημένον τῆς ἀκροάσεως καὶ αὐτοπτῆσαι σπεύδοντα τὴν πανήγυριν ὥσπερ κατόπιν ἑορτῆς ἥκοντα, τὸ τοῦ λόγου, παρατρέχεις ὁμοῦ τε ἀνοίξας καὶ λύσας τὸ θέατρον.
>
> Your story has not yet laid out the spectacle for me and I have an exceedingly great desire to listen and to be an eyewitness
> to the pageant passing by—I feel like the proverbial guest who has turned up too late for the feast! You rush through debuting and ending the show at the same time.[423] (3.1.1)

Cnemon's statement also provides an example of an audience member shaping his own entertainment. His vocal responses to Calasiris' performance are a microcosmic example of the reaction of a crowd, in praise or censure. The way in which he encourages the priest to tell the story that he wishes to hear is similar to the way that a declaimer's audience provides suggestions for declamation topics.[424] He asks for a description that will allow him to 'see' the ceremony for himself. In essence, Cnemon demands an *ekphrasis* complete with *enargeia*.[425]

Not only does Cnemon's comment testify to the arresting power of Calasiris as a speaker, it prompts a reading audience to fall under his spell. The idea that Calasiris has raised and dropped the curtain again serves to place Calasiris' tale in the realm of performance. Seeing for oneself and translating the aural into the visual are the staples of high culture's entertainment modes. Calasiris is invited to use *enargeia*, without which one cannot be a good declaimer—or a good forensic orator. He does the job of a professional declaimer, an orator in court, and an actor. The way that Cnemon voices his combination of praise and criticism casts Calasiris as a performer across the performance spectrum. If, as Fusillo claims, Cnemon is a 'proxy' for the reader,

[423] Walden (1894: 27) discusses the question of the stage curtain rising or falling.
[424] Philostratus credits Gorgias of Leontini with being the first declaimer to ask for a topic suggestion from his audience (Philostratus, *VS* 493). At *VS* 579, an audience chooses a topic the sophist Philagros of Cilicia has used before and mock him by chanting back at him the rehearsed speech he has tried to present as extempore.
[425] Sandy (1982a: 28).

then Cnemon's request could be seen to come from the reader himself.[426] In this way, the model reader describes what he wants from the story, and perhaps from Heliodorus' text itself. Cnemon desires a visual experience out of an aural one. If he voices a model reader's desires, then his statement may suggest Heliodorus' desire to provide just such a visual experience for his readers. The novelist creates a surrogate reader who clamours for a theatrical experience, which Heliodorus delivers by means of words.

Calasiris obliges Cnemon and describes the ceremony and accompanying procession in rich detail.[427] There is a true hecatomb, country folk in rural costume, and maidens singing a hymn in praise of the line of Peleus. Cnemon interjects again, complaining he has gotten a view (θεατήν) but no accompanying sound (ἀκροατήν, 3.2.3). Cnemon is a demanding audience— previously he had required expansive visual detail, and here he requests a 'soundtrack' of sorts to accompany the detail. He continues to require a description that will recreate the experience of the spectacle. Willy Wonka invented a chewing gum that provided the entire experience of a multi-course meal through taste; Calasiris is given the more difficult task of creating multi-sensory spectacle through words alone. It is exactly what the skilled and histrionic declaimer has to do in order to be a competitive alternative to *tragoidoi* and pantomimes. He must create the full theatrical experience with simply language. Dio Chrysostom in his *Oration to the Alexandrians* (32.68) claims that sophists and public speakers, even doctors, must sing in order to keep the attention of the theatre-mad Alexandrians. Although his statement is hyperbolic, it speaks to the difficulties faced by declaimers to keep up with flashier entertainers who have the help of stage

[426] Fusillo (1988: 27ff), Morgan (1989a: 106) Paulsen (1992: 17-18), Hardie (1998: 26).
[427] See Kavoulaki (1999) for a discussion of public procession as an aspect of performance culture in the polis.

paraphernalia and the support of musicians. Heliodorus (via Calasiris) has the even more difficult task of holding his audience's attention through the written word.

Cnemon's comment suggests that Calasiris has succeeded with the visual element; Cnemon can now see the procession. The implicit suggestion is that the reader, too, has this view. Every demand by Cnemon for greater detail from Calasiris is a request on the behalf of the reader, and Cnemon's framing of the description as one that he can experience physically suggests that the reader is meant to as well.[428] Winkler has suggested that Cnemon is a '*lector non scrupulosus*',[429] but I argue that rather he is a 'reader' well acquainted with and well pleased by theatrical entertainment, which makes it possible for him to 'experience' Calasiris' tale in a very satisfying way. His verbal praise, encouragement and demands all serve to increase his own enjoyment in the entertainment. Calasiris recites the hymn to the best of his recollection (3.2.4), then elaborates

> Τοσοῦτον δέ τι ἐμμελείας περιῆν τοῖς χοροῖς καὶ οὕτω συμβαίνων ὁ κρότος τοῦ βήματος πρὸς τὸ μέλος ἐρρυθμίζετο, ὡς τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν τῶν ὁρωμένων ὑπερφρονεῖν ὑπὸ τῆς ἀκοῆς ἀναπείθεσθαι καὶ συμπαρέπεσθαι μεταβαινούσαις ἀεὶ ταῖς παρθένοις τοὺς παρόντας, ὥσπερ ὑπὸ τῆς κατὰ τὴν ᾠδὴν ἠχοῦς ἐφελκομένους
>
> Such were the harmonies in this chorus that the sound of their steps kept time with the music, that the eye, enchanted by the sound, forgot to see; and as the maidens passed by, the onlookers moved along with them, as if drawn by the sounds of the song (3.3.1)

Calasiris' description is both extremely visual and extremely aural. The image of listeners who are so captivated by music that they fall into step with the singers is beautiful and evocative— and is again a case where the power of a spectacle is

[428] Futre Pinheiro (1992: 76).
[429] Winkler (1982: 143), Sandy (1982b: 143-144), Futre Pinheiro (1992: 73).

depicted through its effect on its audience. Aelian writes of teaching children using music, so that the music would enrapture them (ἵνα ἐκ τῆς μουσικῆς ψυχαγωγῶνται), and they would remember the words incidentally.[430] The music in Calasiris' tale is equally somatic, though not didactic. Just as Cnemon's reactions highlight Calasiris' narrative abilities, within Calasiris' tale an audience is used to highlight the power of spectacle. Heliodorus uses the performance/audience dynamic as a descriptive technique and as a guide to the reader (just two of the ways that ideas about and techniques from performance serve as tools in his authorial arsenal). Calasiris plays up the power of the visual, and in particular the arresting attraction of the horsemen, by claiming that their appearance outstripped the sound of the music that had been completely captivating.

The mounted youths are led by Theagenes, who Calasiris claims captivated the crowd. After a detailed description of Theagenes, Calasiris draws a verbal picture of Charicleia. He gives a physical description of both, paying particular and elaborate attention to their costumes. Cnemon responds enthusiastically. 'It's them', he cries, 'it's Chariclea and Theagenes!' (Οὗτοι ἐκεῖνοι Χαρίκλεια καὶ Θεαγένης, 3.4.7). When Calasiris asks where, Cnemon replies,

> θεωρεῖν αὐτοὺς καὶ ἀπόντας ᾠήθην, οὕτως ἐναργῶς τε καὶ οὓς οἶδα ἰδὼν ἡ παρὰ σοῦ διήγησις ὑπέδειξεν
>
> your description displayed them, even though they are not here, so vividly and as I know them from my own experience, that I seemed to see them before me (3.4.7).

[430] Aelian, *VH* 2.39.

Winkler takes this to mean that Cnemon is a rube, falling under Calasiris' spell without even noticing—like a joke out of Plautus' *Pseudolus*.[431] Instead, his exclamation can be taken a marker of appreciation.[432] He is getting the sensory experience he asked for, which is a compliment to the skill of the speaker. This playful depiction of the results of *ekphrasis* creating a sensory reaction is not without parallels—in Philostratus' *Imagines*, the speaker asks if his listener can smell the garden and promises προσβαλεῖ γάρ σε μετὰ τοῦ λόγου καὶ τὰ μῆλα, 'along with my description of the garden the [fragrance of] apples will also come to you.[433] In addition, Cnemon uses the adverb ἐναργῶς, confirming that Calasiris' tale is full of *enargeia.*

Here, in a story in a novel, Cnemon's excited reaction to a description could serve to underline the accuracy and authority of Calasiris' descriptions. Cnemon had agreed with Calasiris' description of Delphi, based on his father's recounting of the sanctuary. Cnemon has seen Theagenes and Chariclea in real life, and so can judge Calasiris' accuracy in his own right. Cnemon's claim to see them in his mind as well as in his eye again invites the reader to do so as well, further suggestion that Heliodorus' written word is as good as a living image. This climax— the appearance of Theagenes and Chariclea—is prolonged as Cnemon's interruption leads to Calasiris deciding to pause to pray and pour a libation, leaving Cnemon and the reader wanting more (3.4.11). When he does continue, the entire ceremony could be said to fall into the same 'vividness' as the description of Chariclea and Theagenes, as they form the central action and

[431] Plautus, *Pseudolus* 35ff; Winkler (1982: 143).
[432] Futre Pinheiro (1992: 75) calls it 'an exclamation of enthusiasm'.
[433] Philostratus, *Imagines* 1.6. Another moment in *Imagines* also shares some similarity with this moment in Heliodorus. In 1.28, the narrator claims to have been deceived into believing the painted hunting scene before him is real life—though his claims are disingenuous considering he is in the act of describing paintings in an art gallery. For a recent collection of essays on Philostratus, see Bowie and Elsner (2009).

have already been brought into the 'sight' of the reader (3.5.1-6.1). Cnemon's clear enjoyment and absorption in Calasiris' story and his sense of being present at the scene of the action is not an indication of naiveté or that Calasiris' story is 'intellectually unrespectable and devalued',[434] but rather the sign of an excellent rapport between audience and performer.

Calasiris as Performer and Director

As Richard Hunter observes, the 'relationship between Calasiris and his different audiences—Cnemon, the other listeners within the story, and we ourselves—is a subject to which Heliodorus explicitly calls our attention.'[435] In Calasiris' story, he meets Chariclea's adoptive father Charicles, who calls on Calasiris to identify what is ailing his daughter. The Egyptian had observed Theagenes and Chariclea fall in love at first sight (3.5.4) and he can tell she is sick with love. However, he tells Charicles it is the evil eye (3.7.2-8.1).[436] He continues that fallacy later that evening when Charicles notices that Theagenes is listless and assumes he too has fallen under the influence of the 'evil eye', which his Egyptian friend confirms (3.9.1).[437] Calasiris claims that though Theagenes tried to look happy, his true frame of mind did not escape the Egyptian's notice (3.10.4). While Calasiris has successfully fooled Charicles into believing in the evil eye, Theagenes cannot even keep his private emotions from Calasiris, who recognises in his actions 'the mind of a person in love' (διάνοια…ἐρῶντος, 3.10.5).

[434] Dowden (1996: 283), Winkler (1982: 143).
[435] Hunter (1998: 52).
[436] For further on the concept of the 'evil eye' in Heliodorus see Yatromanolakis (1988), Dickie (1991).
[437] Dowden (1996: 283) observes that the Egyptian's speech regarding the evil eye would no doubt entertain readers.

Calasiris, from his 'true wisdom' (ἀληθῶς σοφία),[438] or from being able to read body language, knows that Theagenes and Chariclea are both in love. Reading body language falls with the 'performance spectrum' of the time, when knowledge of physiognomy was required to interpret the personalities and qualities of the characters on a stage, even in sophistic performance and especially in silent pantomime. When Theagenes comes and asks for help, but is too ashamed to admit the reason, Calasiris takes advantage of his knowledge to prod Theagenes along. He says, 'And so I thought it was time for some showmanship and to foretell what I already knew' (Ἔγνων οὖν καιρὸν εἶναι τερατεύεσθαι πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ μαντεύεσθαι δῆθεν ἅπερ ἐγίνωσκον, 3.17.1). He explains,

> Καὶ ἐπιστήσας ὀλίγον καὶ ψήφους τινὰς οὐδὲν καταριθμούσας ἐπὶ δακτύλων συντιθεὶς τὴν τε κόμην διασείσας καὶ τοὺς κατόχους μιμούμενος
>
> I stood briefly, did some meaningless calculations on my fingers, tossed my hair around, and mimed being possessed. (3.17.2)

Calasiris puts on a brief magic show, and the language he uses shows he recognises his performance as a performance. Theagenes, he assumes, believes, like Charicles, in Egyptian magic, and Calasiris meets/exploits his expectations.[439] The result of this act of chicanery is the announcement that the youth loves Chariclea. His gestures and his tricks resemble the kind of 'marvels' performed by street performers and mime.[440] Theagenes is fully convinced, 'he thought a god spoke through me, and nearly threw himself prostrate' (τοῦτ'

[438] Jones (2005) discusses magic in Heliodorus.
[439] Sandy (1982b: 145).
[440] Panayotakis (1995: 34) 'Gesticulation was equally important in the Roman mime', cf. Isidore, *Orig.* 18.49; Cicero, *De. Orat.* 2.252. Beacham (1991: 129) mentions *autokabdaloi* 'improvisers', who performed 'acrobatics, song and dance, jokes, conjuring—every type of broad entertainment in fact'. Dickie (2001: 601) describes *thaumatopoioi* 'wonder-makers' who perform 'conjuring, acrobatics, juggling, and marionette-shows or, in other words, any kind of performance that produced baffled amazement in spectators.'

ἐκεῖνο θεοκλυτεῖν με νομίσας μικροῦ μὲν καὶ προσεκύνει πεσών, 3.17.2). Theagenes sees what he had expected to see and does not question appearances. Ever reticent, Calasiris does not mention that he is aware that Chariclea is already in love with Theagenes, and instead promises to help him win her love.

Later, Calasiris pulls the same kind of 'Egyptian magic' act on Charicles and his daughter, with different results. Calasiris comes to help rid Chariclea of the 'evil eye'. Calasiris explains,

> ἠρχόμην ὥσπερ ἐπὶ σκηνῆς τῆς ὑποκρίσεως καὶ τόν τε λιβανωτὸν ἐθυμίων καί τινα δῆθεν ψιθύροις τοῖς χείλεσι κατευξάμενος τὴν δάφνην ἐκ κεφαλῆς εἰς πόδας ἄνω καὶ κάτω πυκνὰ τῆς Χαρικλείας ἐπεσόβουν καὶ ὑπνῶδές τι μᾶλλον δὲ γραῶδες ἐπιχασμώμενος
>
> I began as if impersonating a character on the stage, burning incense, whispering some sounds with my lips, like praying, waving the laurel from Chariclea's head to her toes, up and down repeatedly and yawning often, like someone sleepy or, rather, like an old lady. (4.5.3)

The late fifth century Byzantine priest Jacob of Sarugh mentions that the pantomime dancer burned perfume onstage.[441] It is possible that Calasiris' clouds of smoke could have confirmed a theatrical reference for readers, perhaps a parody of ritual from New Comedy, as suggested by Émile Feuillâtre,[442] or from contemporary subliterary performance. The ritual he seems to counterfeit is a Greek one, usually performed by old women yawning to draw out and dispel the evil eye.[443] Chariclea is cannier than Theagenes, as Calasiris admits,

> πυκνὰ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐπέσειε καὶ σεσηρὸς ὑπεμειδία, πλανᾶσθαι με τὴν ἄλλως καὶ τὴν νόσον ἀγνοεῖν ἐνδεικνυμένη
>
> She shook her head again and again and smiled a little as if to indicate to me that I was completely off track and had no understanding of her illness. (4.5.4)

[441] Jacob of Sarugh, *Homily* 3, Folio 11 verso a. In the Barcelona *Alcestis*, which Hall (2008: 166) suggests could be a pantomime libretto, Alcestis arranges spices to be burnt with her funeral pyre.
[442] Feuillâtre (1966: 122-123).
[443] Morgan (1989a: 427 n 106).

Chariclea does not fall for the charlatan act,[444] but it does not seem that she can grasp Calasiris' true motives. In her defence, who could? Calasiris recounts the way he put on a series of performances, but he does not make it immediately clear why the performances are necessary or how they will bring the audience closer to understanding the events of the novel thus far. Unlike in Cnemon's tale, where the schemer's plans were made clear to the reader from the outset and followed step by step, Calasiris' story is opaque, requiring the audience to pay attention to the whole in order to understand the outcome.

When Calasiris informs Chariclea of her Ethiopian royal heritage he also encourages the girl to tell him what is troubling her. When she is too ashamed to admit it, in a manner similar to Theagenes' confession, Calasiris does for Chariclea what he did not do for the one she loves: he tells the truth. 'I do not need to learn what I knew from my art long ago' (ἐγώ τε γὰρ οὐδὲν δέομαι μανθάνειν ἃ πάλαι παρὰ τῆς τέχνης ἔγνωκα, 4.10.4). He tells her that he can help her marry Theagenes and return to the land of her birth— in keeping with the oracle pronounced earlier (4.13.2). But in order for his plan to succeed, she must put on a performance. He tells her to appear to submit to her father's long desire for her to marry his nephew: 'pretend to consent to marry Alkamenes' (Πλάττεσθαι… ὡς ἐπινεύουσαν τὸν Ἀλκαμένους γάμον, 4.13.3). Πλάττεσθαι is a loaded term. Πλάσμα means many things in literary criticism, mainly having to do with fiction. In the tragic scholia, the term can range from 'falsehood' to 'creative invention'.[445] Within rhetoric, πλάσμα is 'the usual term for the invented scenario of a declamation which has no specific historical setting; also,

[444] Sandy (1982b: 145-146).
[445] Papadopoulou (1999: 210).

a declamation of this kind'.[446] Calasiris encourages Chariclea to lie, but does so using a term associated with the creative invention of drama and declamation. When she asks about his plans, he assures her,

> ἔπου μόνον ταῖς ἐμαῖς ὑποθήκαις τά τε ἄλλα καὶ τὸ παρὸν τῷ Χαρικλεῖ σύντρεχε τὰ πρὸς τὸν γάμον, ὡς οὐδὲν ἐκείνου πράξαντος ἄνευ τῆς ἐμῆς ὑφηγήσεως
>
> Just follow my instructions and especially at the moment you must go along with Charicles' plans for your wedding; as he has done nothing without my instruction. (4.13.5)

Calasiris becomes not only a performer but also a director, in his stage-management of Chariclea and her adoptive father.

After Calasiris has set up the wedding scheme, he tells Theagenes and Chariclea what to do next. He describes the events of the next day, how Theagenes and his followers dressed as revelers, made a great din and broke into Chariclea's home and 'kidnapped' her:

> καὶ τὴν Χαρίκλειαν εὐτρεπῆ καὶ ἅπαντα προειδυῖαν καὶ τὴν βίαν ἑκοῦσαν ὑφισταμένην ἀναρπάζουσιν οὐκ ὀλίγα τῶν ἐπίπλων ὅσα κατὰ βούλησιν ἦν τῇ κόρῃ συνεκφορήσαντες.
>
> They snatched Chariclea, who was prepared and knew all, willingly submitting to this 'violent assault', and taking with them not a few of such items according to the wish of the girl (4.17.4-5)

Calasiris devised the plan for Theagenes and his group of youths to dress in arms and pretend to be revelers. His description includes their costume, attitude and stage directions. The stage has been set with the tampered gate, and their victim is a willing captive, their stolen items agreed upon baggage. The scene, as Calasiris notes, is meant to frighten the town's inhabitants and convince them that this 'show' is real.

[446] Russell (1983: 140).

After this getaway, the young couple turn to Calasiris, who shelters them as the rest of the Thessalians travel on. Calasiris goes to the devastated Charicles and announces that the culprits are Theagenes and his band (4.19.4). The announcement may seem shocking to a reader, as for a moment it seems that Calasiris has both engineered and unraveled the lovers' escape. In a scene reminiscent of Cnemon's father's speech in Cnemon's story, Charicles stands before his fellow Delphians, face begrimed, in the theatre where a special assembly is being held.[447] He gives a speech telling of his love for his adoptive daughter (4.19). Before he can even conclude the military commander announces that their forces should leave at once to catch the Thessalians, and soon the city is in arms and on their way. But Charicles' emotional display and the city's reaction were part of Calasiris' plan all along. In the confusion he brings Chariklea and Theagenes to the port and the three sail off on a Phoenician ship.

In this final portion, Calasiris manipulates Charicles one final time, mixing lies with truth in pinning responsibility for the attack on the Thessalians (who acted on his advice) and claiming that none are left in the city.[448] His credible performance and further exhortation lead to the city assembly which sends all opposition after the Thessalians over land, leaving Calasiris and his protégés safe to flee by water. Charicles' moving speech is related in full, an unnecessary addition and yet one that adds pathos and emotional conflict (4.19.6-9). Although the reader is likely to side with the protagonists and wish them a successful escape, the sad story of Charicles losing his second daughter gives the scene an added poignancy. Charicles' speech is also an opportunity for Calasiris

[447] The public assemblies in a theatre resembles Chariton 1.1.11-12, 3.4.3-18, 8.7.1-14. Saïd (1994: 222) observes that the theatre takes the place of the agora in the Greek novels.
[448] Such a mixture of truth and lies is the combination the Odysseus encourages Neoptolemus to use in Sophocles' *Philoctetes* 55-85.

to employ another rhetorical technique, *ethopoiia*, treating Cnemon to a speech in the character of Charicles.

Conclusion

Calasiris' story is layered and multi-faceted—a performance about performances. It is delivered to the consummate audience, someone who can appreciate his skill and take pleasure in the story for its entertainment value. Within the story itself, Calasiris encounters different kinds of audiences, ranging from the naïve and easily manipulated Charicles and Theagenes to the skeptical Chariclea and the theatrically oriented Cnemon. For Chariclea, Calasiris must drop his act and let her in on his machinations—it is only when she is allowed to become a fellow performer that she follows his plans. For Cnemon, on the other hand, Calasiris must play up his acting powers—not to manipulate but to entertain.

In Achilles Tatius, Clitophon is aware of his status as a storyteller. Clitophon recognises that storytelling can create bonds between people, creating sympathy, but he does not use performance to the extreme degree that Calasiris does. Leucippe, in contrast, is an unwilling performer, who nonetheless appears to grasp the theatricality of her situation. She recognises that the persona of Lacaena is a role she plays. As discussed in the previous chapter, her audience, Thersander, further underlines this theatricality by praising her words and her passion (6.17.1). Though less overtly, Thersander, like Cnemon, comments on the qualities of the speech he listened to, as if it were a performance he had enjoyed on the stage. Both characters take pleasure in the form and content of speeches, treating them as entertainment.

Chariton's protagonists appear to be the least aware of their status as entertainers, while their audiences seem to have the greatest power over their destinies. It is the simplest formula of the three novels, and yet still very much reveals an awareness of the relationship between performer and audience, with a focus on how much an audience can become invested in a performer. When Callirhoe becomes a travelling spectacle in Asia, the women of Persia decide to compete with her beauty as a matter of national pride—without Callirhoe being any the wiser. In Chariton, the audience is often the strongest force in the performer/audience relationship. Clitophon's narration begins to address the power of a performer, but it is Heliodorus who explores the many ways a performer can interact with a variety of audiences.

4. Chariclea the Actress

Introduction

Heliodorus' Chariclea is perhaps the most proactive of all the heroines of the Greek novels.[449] Often she takes a leading role in decision-making and even takes an active part in battle by shooting arrows at brawling pirates.[450] She also holds the highest rank—even before she is revealed to be an Ethiopian princess, she is a priestess of Artemis at Delphi. One of Chariclea's other distinguishing characteristics is her ability to put on performances. It is no surprise that Heliodorus initially introduces Chariclea through the eyes of other characters, as she is a person to watch throughout the novel. The novel's non-linear structure disguises Chariclea's linear progression from a self-possessed young woman who participates in public ceremonies out of duty to someone who finds opportunities to use public and private performance to her own advantage. Before her adventures begin, her beauty draws the attention of the crowd in Delphi (3.4.8). When Chariclea eventually reaches Ethiopia, she chooses to don her Delphic raiment before facing a crowd, strategically making use of a costume that had garnered admiration earlier in order to impress the Ethiopians (10.9.3-4). In addition to acting as a simple spectacle in public ceremonies, Chariclea takes part in performances reminiscent of a variety of performance genres. She gives impromptu speeches and sways her audiences like a sophist, even employing law court rhetoric. Her public reunions with her lover Theagenes and her mentor Calasiris both have tragic overtones. Not all of Chariclea's performances are related to 'high' culture references. She and Calasiris disguise themselves as

[449] Sandy (1982b: 166), Pernot (1992: 46), Haynes (2003: 67).
[450] She faces competition from Xenophon of Ephesus' Anthia, who successfully defends herself from sexual aggression.

beggars, using their belongings as impromptu props, as if they were itinerant street performers. Her two beggar disguises also fall into the realm of mythological burlesque. As I will discuss in chapter eight, her experiences in Memphis resemble the sort of intrigue found in the mime script *Moicheutria.*

Her theatrical nature also goes beyond the situational. Chariclea shows an awareness of the nature of performance and an understanding of the power of spectacle. Back in Delphi, she is able to recognise Calasiris' charlatan act as a performance. She is quick to follow his stage directions in Delphi and beyond. Building on the theatrical education provided by the priest, she embarks on performances of her own. Of her own volition, she employs costumes, make-up, props, and even her natural beauty in order to make specific impressions on specific audiences. Her familiarity with tragic performance is suggested by her reference to the *mêchanê*, which also serves as a meta-commentary on the theatricality (and even the poetics) of the novel.[451] The wide array of possible theatrical resonances displays Chariclea's adaptability and her facility for improvisation. Her (apparently) innate understanding of the theatrical helps her find her way out of seemingly impossible situations. The ability to perform becomes a survival skill. [452] Chariclea's theatrical antics are particularly entertaining to a reader who recognises her participation in a variety of performance genres and tropes.

Seeing Chariclea

In the opening scene of the novel, discussed in the previous chapter, the unnamed Chariclea is watched by a group of bandits. At first they mistake her for

[451] Heliodorus 2.8.3
[452] Haynes (2003: 69).

a goddess, with her bright robe and quiver of arrows. At this moment she is an unconscious performer, unaware of her audience and completely focused on the intimate scene of which she is a part—the cradling of her wounded lover. She is like Electra tending to her brother in Euripides' *Orestes*, delivering a monologue as if there were no audience.[453] This is an 'actress' in the tragic mode,[454] completely embedded in the illusion of the 'play', in contrast to the comic mode, where an actor acknowledges his status as an actor and openly addresses his audience. When she does sense a presence, she believes it is the ghosts of the bandits who have died in the battle, and addresses them only to request that they leave her alone. Her audience do not understand her words. When they do leave, it is because they see a threat in the distance, not because of her entreaty.[455] While the scene prepares a reader for a visual, theatrical experience with the young woman as an object of the reader's 'gaze', it does not reveal the young woman's awareness of the potential of playing to and for an audience. Even as she appears like a tragic character, she does not reveal her capacity for conscious performance.

Consciousness of acting, and of playing a role in front of others, is particularly prominent in Heliodorus' text. Chariton's Callirhoe finds herself an unwilling spectacle wherever she goes. Chariclea, who is equally beautiful and equally capable of capturing the attention of great crowds, takes much more advantage of her natural ability to enthrall people. The most striking example is found in the final book of the novel, in which she makes herself into a stunning spectacle to capture the favour of the crowd and the attention of her royal

[453] Euripides, *Orestes* 1-70. Dworacki (1996: 358) likens Chariclea's initial silence to that of Aeschylus' Niobe.
[454] Feuillâtre (1966: 117), Winkler (1982: 105), Paulsen (1992: 55), Dworacki (1996: 358).
[455] Winkler (1982: 105), Saïd (1992: 175).

parents. The scene echoes Chariclea's very first appearance—again she appears like a god to people who do not speak her language. As in the opening scene, much of the final scene is filtered through its internal audience.[456] The difference is that now Chariclea is shown at the height of her performative powers, as she puts on the show of her life to save her life and the life of the man she loves. In both the opening and closing scenes, her beloved Theagenes is also present—grievously wounded in the first, and at risk of execution in the second. Though Theagenes is also an object of spectacle, he rarely takes centre-stage or performs intentionally, as Chariclea does.[457]

In Calasiris' tale, the priest describes both Chariclea and Theagenes' appearances in detail during their appearance in a religious procession, as well as the effect they have on the viewing crowd. The pair are captivating both by their beauty and their bearing, qualities found in Callirhoe and Chaereas, who similarly stun viewers through their appearance more than their actions.[458] Chariclea and Theagenes's ability to win over their audience through their appearance is a trait they share with many of the sophists who are often described as elegant in appearance.'[459] In particular, they have the same visual power of Alexander Peloplaton,

> εὐσταλὴς δὲ οὕτω τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ἔδοξεν, ὡς καὶ βόμβον διελθεῖν αὐτῶν ἔτι σιωπῶντος ἐπαινεσάντων αὐτοῦ τὸ εὔσχημον.
>
> The Athenians thought him so well-dressed that before he spoke a word a hum went round, approving of his elegance.[460]

[456] Morgan (1992: 91).
[457] Anderson (1984: 64) and Haynes (2003: 67-68) observe that Theagenes is rather consistently outshone by Chariclea in person and in force of personality, but as Morgan (1989c: 317) and Haynes (2003: 87) point out, Theagenes is not without his moments of merit.
[458] Zeitlin (2003). See chapter two for further on Callirhoe and Chaereas' passivity.
[459] For example, Adrian of Tyre (Philostratus,*VS* 587) and Apollonius of Athens (Philostratus,*VS* 601).
[460] Philostratus, *VS* 572.

Chariclea and Theagenes are the passive objects of gaze—it takes no particular effort on their own behalf to win over the crowd at Delphi. Their appearance alone leads to them being, in the words of Calasiris,

> οὕτω μὲν περιβλέπτους οὕτω δὲ εὐδαιμονιζομένους καὶ τὴν μὲν ἀνδράσι τὸν δὲ γυναιξὶν εὐχὴν γινομένους,
>
> completely admired and acclaimed. [Chariclea] became an idol to the men and [Theagenes] to the women. (3.4.8)

The gold-embroidered robe Chariclea wears to fulfill her duties of priestess at Delphi is the same one she wears in the opening and closing scenes of the novel—a robe she purposely dons for effect in both episodes. Even at Delphi, the robe is meant for public consumption.

> χιτῶνα δὲ ἁλουργὸν ποδήρη χρυσαῖς ἀκτῖσι κατάπαστον ἠμφίεστο. ζώνην δὲ ἐπεβέβλητο τοῖς στέρνοις· καὶ ὁ τεχνησάμενος εἰς ἐκείνην τὸ πᾶν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ τέχνης κατέκλεισεν… Δυοῖν γὰρ δρακόντοιν τὰ μὲν οὐραῖα κατὰ τῶν μεταφρένων ἐδέσμευε τοὺς δὲ αὐχένας ὑπὸ τοὺς μαζοὺς παραμείψας καὶ εἰς βρόχον συγχωρήσας…Ἔφερε δὲ τῇ λαιᾷ μὲν τόξον ἐπίχρυσον…
>
> She was dressed in a full-length purple gown embroidered with golden rays. A girdle encircled her breast; the man who had crafted it had enclosed all his craft into it… He had interlocked the tails of two serpents at the back; then he had brought their necks round under her breasts and brought them into a knot… In her left hand she carried a bow of gold… (3.4.2-6)

As mentioned earlier, these descriptions help serve to give the reader a vivid experience of the religious procession. [461] The elaborate description of Chariclea's dress has other pay-offs for the author, because Chariclea dons the outfit multiple times, each with a similar effect to the one described. The *ekphrasis* gives the reader an idea of the spectacle she makes in Ethiopia, and also at the banquet on the shore. For a repeat reader, it also helps fill in additional details of the very first scene of the novel.

[461] See chapter three. Bartsch (1989: 115) 'Heliodorus is emphasizing the reader's role as a spectator, and everything (as Morgan notes) is geared toward intensity of experience for this reader.' Cf Morgan (1982: 260).

In the procession, Chariclea must naturally wear festive religious garb. The second time she wears the dress is at Calasiris' behest, when he arranges for her to dress in her finest to 'celebrate' her wedding to the pirate captain (5.29.1-6). The costume change is a strategic move on Calasiris' part, as he knows how lovely she looks in it and he wishes to arouse the jealousy of the captain's second-in-command.[462] The third time she dons the gown, it is of her own volition, part of her own individual plan to be recognised as the daughter of the Ethiopian king and queen (10.9.3-4). On a linear timeline of events, the outfit transforms from a religious costume into a theatrical costume.[463] As events are retold in the novel, however, the first glimpse of Chariclea is when she is in costume.[464]

Meeting Chariclea

Heliodorus postpones the reader's recognition of Chariclea as a seasoned performer, through his aporetic opening and in Cnemon's tale. When Chariclea and Theagenes finally offer a formal explanation of their circumstances, neither the reader nor Cnemon is aware that the tale is mostly a fiction. At a meeting of their captors, the bandit chief Thyamis announces his decision to take Chariclea as his wife,[465] and awaits her response, along with an explanation of her and her companion's background.

> Ἡ δὲ πολύν τινα χρόνον τῇ γῇ τὸ βλέμμα προσερείσασα καὶ πυκνὰ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐπισείουσα λόγον τινὰ καὶ ἐννοίας ἀθροίζειν ἐῴκει· καὶ

[462] Egger (1994: 45).
[463] And back again to religious costume when Chariclea and Theagenes become priests of Helios (10.61.1).
[464] Not only has it been a costume, but a weapon—the golden bow and quiver are a testament that the arrow-struck bodies were her doing, (1.1.5).
[465] Feuillâtre (1966: 122) notes that pirates often featured in New Comedy, and Crismani (1997: 112) observes that in addition to New Comedy, bandits holding a woman captive in a foreign land is a situation similar to the plot of the *Charition* mime in P.Oxy 413.

> δή ποτε πρὸς τὸν Θύαμιν ἀντωπήσασα καὶ πλέον ἢ πρότερον αὐτὸν τῷ κάλλει καταστράψασα (καὶ γὰρ πεφοίνικτο τὴν παρειὰν ὑπὸ τῶν ἐνθυμημάτων πλέον ἢ σύνηθες καὶ τὸ βλέμμα κεκίνητο πρὸς τὸ γοργότερον)
>
> For a long while she stood with her eyes focused on the ground, repeatedly shaking her head, seeming to gather her thoughts for some speech. Finally she looked at Thyamis full in the face, dazzling him with her beauty even more now, for thought had brought more colour to her cheeks than usual, and moved her eyes to more brilliancy. (1.21.3)

This description of Chariclea's pause resembles the preparations of Second Sophistic declaimers, in response to an audience's choice of topic. These public speakers would take a few minutes to gather their thoughts, sometimes in front of the audience, sometimes retiring from the stage.[466] Her expression while she deliberates may also recall the sophists. Philostratus claims

> Τὸ δὲ τῶν ὀφρύων ἦθος καὶ ἡ τοῦ προσώπου σύννοια σοφιστὴν ἐδήλου τὸν Μάρκον, καὶ γὰρ ἐτύγχανεν ἀεί τι ἐπισκοπῶν τῇ γνώμῃ καὶ ἀναπαιδεύων ἑαυτὸν τοῖς ἐς τὸ σχεδιάζειν ἄγουσι.
>
> The expression of his brows and the thoughtfulness of his face showed that Marcus [of Byzantium] was a sophist, and indeed his mind always happened to be pondering over some theme and he was always training himself in the methods geared towards extempore speaking.[467]

The blush in her cheeks and the fire in her eyes also recall another sophist, Alexander Peloplaton, who

> καιρὸν δ᾽ ἐπισχὼν βραχὺν ἀνεπήδησε τοῦ θρόνου φαιδρῷ τῷ προσώπῳ, καθάπερ εὐαγγέλια ἐπάγων τοῖς ἀκροωμένοις ὧν εἰπεῖν ἔχοι.
>
> pausing for a brief space he sprang from his seat with a shining face, like one who brings good news to those listening to what he has to tell them.[468]

---

[466] Philostratus' *VS* offers multiple examples of sophists' deliberations. Hippodromos of Thessaly takes only a moment's pause (σμικρὸν ἐπισχὼν) in a chair before leaping up to declaim (616), while Isaeus of Syria deliberated 'from daybreak to midday' (ἐξ ἕω ἐς μεσημβρίαν, 514).
[467] Philostratus, *VS* 528.
[468] Philostratus, *VS* 572.

Chariclea appears to be as abstracted as Marcus of Byzantium and as beatific as Alexander Peloplaton as she prepares to present her own extempore performance.

Morgan has observed that Heliodorus does not often describe Chariclea's beauty in specific detail as much as he describes the impact of her beauty on others.[469] It is perhaps fitting, then, that Chariclea seems to wield her beauty to take advantage of its effect. She is also capable of concocting both a false background story *and* an excuse to postpone any wedding, on the spot. Chariclea's story places her in a tradition of self-conscious performers for whom the false story is almost a staple. Menelaus in Euripides' *Helen*, Neoptolemus in Sophocles' *Philoctetes* and the friends and family of Chairestratos in Menander's *Aspis* all present false tales.[470] Her speaking abilities and speech topic represent a blend of performance genres and subjects.

Chariclea captivates her audience—Thyamis in particular. Not only does the crowd cry out in favour of her request, but Thyamis agrees as well:

> ὑπὸ μὲν τῆς περὶ τὴν Χαρίκλειαν ἐπιθυμίας καὶ τὴν παροῦσαν ὥραν ἀπέραντον χρόνου μῆκος εἰς ὑπέρθεσιν ἡγούμενος, ὑπὸ δὲ τῶν λόγων ὥσπερ τινὸς σειρῆνος κεκηλημένος καὶ πρὸς τὸ πείθεσθαι κατηναγκασμένος
>
> Because of desire for Chariclea even the length of an hour seemed endless, but she beguiled him with her words like some siren and compelled him to consent. (1.23.2)

Chariclea's words are almost supernaturally persuasive, placing her in company not only with mortal oral performers but also with immortal singers.[471] In addition, 'casting a spell' on one's audience is something said about Philostratus' sophists. Isocrates, Philostratus claims, has a singing Siren standing on his tomb,

[469] Morgan (1991: 87 n 9), also Haynes (2003: 69).
[470] Euripides, *Helen* 1251-93; Sophocles, *Philoctetes* 55-85, 240-390; Menander, *Aspis* 250-490.
[471] Pernot (1992: 45).

which πειθὼ κατηγορεῖ τοῦ ἀνδρός, 'testifies to the persuasion of the man' (*VS* 504). The sophist Favorinus ἔθελγε, 'enchanted', his Roman listeners,

> Διαλεγουμένου δὲ αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὴν Ῥώμην μεστὰ ἦν σπουδῆς πάντα, καὶ γὰρ δὴ καὶ ὅσοι τῆς Ἑλλήνων φωνῆς ἀξύνετοι ἦσαν, οὐδὲ τούτοις ἀφ᾽ ἡδονῆς ἡ ἀκρόασις ἦν, ἀλλὰ κἀκείνους ἔθελγε τῇ τε ἠχῇ τοῦ φθέγματος καὶ τῷ σημαίνοντι τοῦ βλέμματος καὶ τῷ ῥυθμῷ τῆς γλώττης.
>
> When he delivered speeches in Rome, everyone was interested, so much so that all of those present who did not understand the Greek language, not even for those was the hearing without pleasure, but he charmed even them by the tone of his voice and by the expression of his eyes and the rhythm of his speech.[472]

Chariclea's spell also depends on her glance, and she too wins over an audience who do not understand her Greek speech, which Cnemon must translate into Egyptian.[473] The power of her gaze is also reminiscent of the pantomime dancer, such as the performer playing Venus in the pantomime in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, who 'sometimes danced with only her eyes' (*nonnunquam saltare solis oculis*).[474]

The story she tells casts Theagenes and herself as a brother-sister pair of Ephesian priests to Apollo and Artemis who had set sail to organise some religious games (1.22.2-5). She gives them living parents and a great deal of wealth, as well as a large retinue of followers (who were all unfortunately killed when unscrupulous sailors tried to rob them). Her story is virtuous and modest—she tells no romances herself.[475] Instead, she creates social status and the illusion of parental protection, cleverly (and rather concisely, compared to Cnemon's story). Soon after the tale is told, its fictions are brought to light by Theagenes, who asks the meaning of her speech.

---

[472] Philostatus, *VS* 492.
[473] Saïd (1992: 176).
[474] Apuleius, *Met.* 10.32.
[475] Winkler (1982: 111-112) claims that Chariclea's tale is 'nearly a parody of the Greek romance as a genre'.

> τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἀδελφόν με σαυτῆς ἀναπλάττειν σοφὸν εἰς ὑπερβολὴν… Τὸ δὲ ἑτοίμως οὕτως ἐπινεύειν τὸν γάμον… ταῦτα συμβάλλειν οὔτε ἐδυνάμην οὔτε ἐβουλόμην
>
> Pretending that I am your brother was exceedingly clever... But how you readily agreed to marry him... that I am not able, nor do I wish to comprehend. (1.25.6-26.1)

Theagenes helps the reader comprehend some of the lies and begin to appreciate Chariclea's ability to improvise, but also reveals his own inability to completely understand Chariclea's performance. Theagenes is not of the same calibre as Chariclea either as a dramatist or as a performer, and he is not able to intuit her deeper game. She must explain that it is a fiction for their protection (πλάσμα,1.26.5). The choice of the term πλάσμα suggests that Chariclea's fiction is a dramatic one.[476] Her reassurances to Theagenes show that she is well aware of the benefits of playing a role to manipulate. Her explanation that it is better to check the pirates' lust through submission shows that she has a remarkably deep understanding of her audience.[477]

This performance is cut short by an outside attack on the bandits. After the battle, Theagenes continues to be baffled by appearances in his search for Chariclea, who was hidden in a cave. When he and Cnemon stumble across a woman's body lying facedown, Theagenes immediately assumes the corpse is his beloved. He utters a long lament, during which the young man 'cried out in tragic sorrow' (τραγικόν… βρυχώμενος, 2.4.1).[478] Cnemon hears Chariclea's voice from further on in the cave, but Theagenes does not believe him. Nevertheless, Cnemon has the right of it, and when they turn the body over it is someone else. When Chariclea and Theagenes do reunite, they collapse together

[476] Earlier in the novel, Calasiris urges Chariclea to πλάττεσθαι (4.13.3). For further on the term πλάσμα see Papadopoulou (1999) and chapter three of this thesis.
[477] Winkler (1982: 111), Haynes (2003: 72-73).
[478] Walden (1894: 41). See Paulsen (1992: 56-66) for further on lamentation and tragedy in Heliodorus. Birchall (1996) discusses lament as a rhetorical feature in the novels.

with emotion, and apologise to Cnemon for their deportment. Cnemon replies that their love and restraint is admirable,

> Ἀλλ᾽ ἐκεῖνα, ὦ Θεάγενες, οὔτε ἐπαινεῖν εἶχον ὑπερηȣχυνόμην τε ὁρῶν ὡς ἀληθῶς ὅτε τὴν ξένην καὶ προσήκουσαν οὐδαμόθεν γυναῖκα περιπεσὼν ἐθρήνεις ἀγεννῶς καὶ ταῦτα περιεῖναι καὶ ζῆν σοι τὴν φιλτάτην ἐμοῦ διατεινομένου
>
> but there is one thing, Theagenes, that I could not admire, truly I was ashamed to see it—that you threw yourself onto a total stranger and wept ignobly over her despite me proclaiming that your love was alive and safe! (2.7.2)

Cnemon openly rebukes Theagenes for his inability to see beyond initial appearance, and for his hysterical spectacle. His tragic lamentation is not respected, but rather reviled as out of place.

A sense of spectacle continues to be cast over the scene, when Cnemon announces the identity of the dead woman and Chariclea asks, 'How can it be that [she] was sent forth out of the heart of Greece to the remotest parts of Egypt, as if by means of the *mêchanê*?' (πῶς ἦν εἰκός… τὴν ἐκ μέσης τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἐπ᾽ ἐσχάτοις γῆς Αἰγύπτου καθάπερ ἐκ μηχανῆς ἀναπεμφθῆναι; 2.8.3).[479] The comment reveals not only Chariclea's knowledge of the stage and its properties, but is also, for a repeat reader, a metatextual comment on the skill of the author. Who but Heliodorus has brought Thisbe to Egypt, as he has brought the protagonists and Cnemon? Theagenes and Chariclea have come from the very centre of Greece, Delphi (often called the *omphalos*, navel, of the world), and the author has brought them to Egypt.

Chariclea and Calasiris

[479] Walden (1984: 43), Paulsen (1992: 24).

When Calasiris puts on a charlatan act for Theagenes, the young man is completely taken in. Chariclea is presented with a more elaborate performance, and seems not to believe the Egyptian at all. She sees through his pretense in the same way that Calasiris sees beyond Theagenes' attempts to be a cheerful host when he is experiencing the ill effects of falling in love. It seems that being a skilled performer can lead one to be able to recognise performances. Chariclea is the person with whom Calasiris is most truthful and the one he most welcomes into his plans. Even Theagenes is presented with performances and half-truths, which he swallows without question. Winkler argues that Calasiris' respect and care for Chariclea allow him to discovery her identity, but in doing so Winkler ignores Chariclea's own agency. Calasiris can respect her because she is able to understand him and see through the magician exterior.[480] Chariclea has no difficulty following through when Calasiris tells her to pretend (πλάττεσθαι) to consent to marry her cousin Alkamenes.[481] Both Theagenes and Chariclea play roles, of captor and captive, when Theagenes leads a *komos*, 'band of revelers' into Chariclea's house at night and they 'abduct' their willing victim (4.17.3).[482] In this case, Calasiris is the mastermind, as he has told them what to do (4.17.2). The young couple perform, but only parts that another has devised—at this point they are players but not playwrights.

Calasiris continues to direct performances after the three are abducted by pirates. The pirate leader, Trachinos, is captivated by Chariclea's beauty and confesses his love. Calasiris relates,

> ἡ δέ (ἔστι γὰρ χρῆμα σοφώτατον) καιρὸν διαθέσθαι δραστήριος ἅμα δέ τι καὶ τῆς ἐμῆς ὑποθήκης ἀνύουσα, τὸ κατηφὲς ἐκ τῶν

[480] Winkler (1982: 137).
[481] Though Calasiris does demur when she asks why it is necessary. Hunter (1998: 51-52).
[482] Theagenes 'commands this campaign of love', which may be a reference to love elegy (ἐστρατήγει δὲ Θεαγένης τὸν ἐρωτικὸν τοῦτον πόλεμον, 4.17.3).

> περιεστηκότων τοῦ βλέμματος ἀπεσκευασμένη καὶ πρὸς τὸ ἐπαγωγότερον ἐκβιασαμένη
>
> She, for she is the cleverest thing, ready to turn a situation to her advantage, but also acting on my counsel, put off the downcast expression that had been on her face, and put an effort into an alluring expression (5.26.2-3)

Chariclea pretends to be pleased by this news and requests that Trachinos spare the lives of her 'father' and 'brother' as proof of his love. Chariclea's feigned joy is the opposite of Helen's feigned mourning in Euripides' *Helen*. Helen must hide her joy at the miraculous appearance of Menelaus and display grief at his 'death'.[483] Calasiris praises her quick thinking and her ability to turn any situation to her advantage. Like a sophist, she can read her audience and tailor her self-presentation to suit each circumstance. Chronologically, this speech occurs before she delivers her performance for the bandit Thyamis. Here, she has Calasiris by her side, with his ὑποθήκη to guide her. Her first speech is perhaps a product of this initial encounter, where she learned how to handle bandits from her mentor.

Calasiris claims 'thus he was moved to pity by her tears, and he was ensnared into obedience by her eyes' (Ὡς δὲ ὑπό τε τῶν δακρύων πρὸς οἶκτον ἤγετο καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν βλεμμάτων πρὸς τὸ ὑπήκοον ἐδουλοῦτο, 5.26.4). As in the first speech, her eyes enchant her audience. Trachinos experiences the typical emotional reaction of *oiktos*, pity, that Clitophon incites in the Egyptian general and that tragic actors reportedly incited in their audiences.[484] Chariclea is just as capable of provoking an emotional reaction from her captors and arousing pity in the people least expected to show it.

[483] Euripides, *Helen* 1193-1249.
[484] Achilles Tatius (3.14.3-4); Plutarch, *Vit. Lys.* 15.2-3; Plutarch, *de fortuna Alexandri* 2.1.

When Trachinos tells Calasiris of his plans to wed Chariclea, the old man 'showed himself to be delighted' (χαίρειν ἐνεδεικνύμην, 5.29.2) and begs that the ship be considered the girl's private bridal chamber so Chariclea may dress for the wedding. In private, Chariclea weeps and tells her guardian that she will kill herself before her wedding can be consummated, but happily Calasiris has more tricks up his sleeve. The Egyptian tells Peloros, the pirate second-in-command, that Chariclea is in love with him, not with Trachinos. He convinces the pirate to take a sneak peak at Chariclea in her wedding finery: 'At the sight he was, of course, set aflame' (διακαίεται ὡς εἰκὸς τῇ θέᾳ, 5.31.2).[485] Peloros' response is similar to that of viewers who were love-struck at the sight of pantomime dancers.[486] The description of an emotional response from a spectator emphasises the 'spectacle of theater'.[487] Peloros also seems to be engaging in an act familiar to anyone who had viewed an artwork depicting actors 'backstage', such as Attic vase-paintings like the Pronomos vase. [488] One vase found Cerveteri seems particularly similar—it depicts two youths in the act of putting on female costumes.[489] The pirate is looking in on a private scene, before the pageantry truly begins. This extra layer of imagery in which Chariclea prepares to 'play' the bride is only available to the discerning reader.

With the seeds of discord sown, it is not long before the pirates' marital merrymaking turns to mutiny. Calasiris flees during the chaos and proceeds to present the reader with the events of the opening scene, from another hilltop, and another point of view (5.33.1-3). At that point, Calasiris becomes a spectator of

[485] Egger (1994: 45 n 23) sees this scene, in rather stronger terms, as the reader sharing in voyeurism 'through the eyes of a would-be rapist'.
[486] Firmicius Maternus, *Mathesis* 6.31.85; Minucius Felix, *Octavius* 37.12. Cf. Lada-Richards (2007: 71-73).
[487] Bartsch (1989: 118).
[488] Lissarrague (2010: 45, plate 44).
[489] Hart (2010: plate 15, see also plates 16-17).

the young protagonists' actions. He finally provides the reader with the missing pieces of the novel's initial puzzle by offering an explanation of the novel's opening scene—it was the aftermath of this battle over Chariclea. Calasiris tells Cnemon, 'what a sight followed!' (τί ἦν ἰδεῖν τὸ ἐντεῦθεν, 5.32.1). The Egyptian, for once, steps out of the spotlight and into the role of spectator, watching the fighting from a hilltop a safe distance away (5.32.3). He takes a vantage point similar to that of Pentheus on Mount Kithaeron in Euripides' *Bacchae.*[490] Darkness draws a curtain on the battle scene, but in the morning he experiences the same view as the puzzled bandits from book one, but with much more comprehension (5.33.1).[491] The reader now understands the opening, not through an explanation by a participant, but by a better informed viewer.

When Chariclea returns to the narrative in person instead of in Calasiris' memory, it is because she has again performed at the bidding of another. She and Theagenes are captured and separated. The merchant Nausikles searches among the captives for his mistress Thisbe. He instead encounters Chariclea and recognises that her beauty would make her a valuable captive. He calls Chariclea 'Thisbe', threatens her that she should play along, and orders her released into his custody (5.8.4). Chariclea takes his cue and plays the role of 'Thisbe'. Fortuitously, Nausikles happens to be hosting Cnemon and Calasiris at his home. The girl and the priest have an emotional reunion:

> τὰ πρῶτα κάτω νεύουσα καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον εἰς ὀφρὺν σκέπουσα τοῦ Ναυσικλέους θαρρεῖν παρακελευομένου μικρὸν ἀνένευσεν … ὀδυρμὸς ἅπασιν ἀθρόον ἀνεκινήθη καὶ ὥσπερ ἐξ ἑνὸς συνθήματος ἠ πληγῆς τῆς αὐτῆς ἀνωλόλυξαν. Ἦν τε ἀκούειν ἐπὶ πλεῖστον «ὦ πάτερ» καὶ «ὦ θύγατερ» καὶ «ἀληθῶς Χαρίκλεια καὶ οὐχὶ Θίσβη»

[490] Euripides, *Bacchae* 1065-1075.
[491] Interestingly, Calasiris only mentions one set of bandits, who imprison his young charges and cause him to stay concealed. Is this an instance of narrative economy of Calasiris' part, showing that he is capable of editing the entire truth in order to create a more concise and entertaining story?

> at first stood with her head down and her face covered up to her brow, but when Nausikles bade her to take heart, she looked up a little… They all burst into tears and cried aloud, as though by a concerted signal, or as though all dealt the same blow. For a while all that was to be heard were cries of 'Father!' 'Daughter!' and 'Truly it is Chariclea and not Thisbe!' (5.11.1-2)

To Nausikles the scene looks like a 'drama'.[492] He witnesses 'a recognition scene as if on the stage' (καθάπερ ἐπὶ σκηνῆς ἀναγνωρισμὸς, 5.11.2). As with the discovery of Thisbe, the encountering of someone previously lost is likened to a showpiece from drama. Chariclea is veiled, as if a character in one of the Aeschylean dramas that Euripides derides in Aristophanes' *Frogs*, where there are characters who sit veiled and silent for the greater part of the action.[493] The *anagnorisis* naturally brings to mind both tragedy and New Comedy.[494]

Chariclea, who has been freed by 'acting' as someone else, then experiences a reunion that appears to its spectator as something out of a drama. Not only are her actions steeped in performance, the very words Heliodorus uses to describe them are as well. Not only is the language reminiscent of performance, but the words are used to describe the experience of an internal audience to the scene. The internal audience may serve as a model for the reader, who is also welcome to recognise and enjoy the image of an *anagnorisis*, perhaps with the extra enjoyment that comes from knowing Calasiris' and Chariclea's relationship to each other, an advantage that Nausikles does not have.

After Chariclea and Calasiris reunite, they decide to continue the search of Theagenes on their own. Chariclea suggests, 'if you agree, let us invent this disguise now and be beggars' (εἰ δὴ συναρέσκει πλαττώμεθα τὸ σχῆμα καὶ

[492] Walden (1894) does not include the term ἀναγνωρισμὸς.
[493] Aristophanes, *Frogs* 911-926.
[494] Crismani (1997: 115) emphasises the New Comedy aspects, Montiglio (2012a: 151) argues for a tragic emphasis.

πτωχεύωμεν, 6.10.2). The verb πλαττώμεθα again recalls fictions created for performance, and in particular recalls Calasiris' earlier exhortation that Chariclea πλάττεσθαι (4.13.3). Now it is Chariclea who proposes that they pretend. The pair immediately set about creating their costumes, make-up and even props.

> ἔπειτα ἡ μὲν Χαρίκλεια τό τε πρόσωπον ἐνύβριζεν ἀσβόλου τε ἐντρίψει καὶ πηλοῦ καταχρίσει μολύνασα καὶ κρηδέμνου ῥυπῶντος τὸ κράσπεδον ἀπὸ μετώπου κατὰ θατέρου τοῖν ὀφθαλμοῖν εἰς ἄτακτον προκάλυμμα ἐπισοβοῦσα...
>
> Then Chariclea smeared her face with soot and rubbed on mud to make it dirty, and arranged a filthy kerchief so that the edge of it hung down over one eye like a skewed veil.[495] (6.11.3)

Chariclea hides her Delphic robes and recognition tokens in a bundle, and Calasiris unstrings her bow to use as a staff. Heliodorus presents their disguises as impromptu and realistic, making use of objects already at hand and explaining how Chariclea manages to hold on to all of her precious possessions on the route to (eventually) Ethiopia. They sound like a pair of itinerant performers, not unlike the two roadside mimes described by John of Ephesos.[496]

Calasiris and Chariclea are aware of their theatrical performance, and even enjoy it— 'they teased one another a little, about how well the costume suited each of them' (μικρὰ καὶ ἐπισκώψαντες εἰς ἀλλήλους καὶ ὡς πρέποι τὸ σχῆμα θάτερος θατέρῳ, 6.12.1). They even put on performances on the road:

> εἴ πή τισιν ἐντευξόμενος προΐδοι κυφότητά τε πλέον ἐπετήδευεν ἢ τὸ γῆρας ἐπηνάγκαζε καὶ τοῖν σκέλοιν θάτερον παρεσύρετο, πρὸς τῆς Χαρικλείας ἔσθ' ὅτε χειραγωγούμενος
>
> If [Calasiris] encountered someone on the road, he put on a stoop greater than his age required and developed a limp in one leg; sometimes he would be led by the hand by Chariclea (6.11.4)

[495] The way she disguises her beauty is similar to the way Euripides' eponymous Helen makes herself ugly in 'mourning' before her performance for Theoclymenus (Euripides, *Helen* 1186-1190).
[496] John of Ephesos, *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, *PO* 19, p 166.

Calasiris and Chariclea's beggar disguises are so good (unlike the earlier disguises attempted by Chariclea and Theagenes) that they make Calasiris seem a stranger to his own sons and Chariclea unrecognisable to Theagenes.[497] This episode provides a double recognition scene, between Calasiris and his sons, and Chariclea and Theagenes. This second set of recognition scenes is not only twice the spectacle as the previous one in Nausikles' home but it also uses the two same characters from the first. The novel's third and final set of recognition scenes will also include Chariclea. Calasiris and Chariclea continue to be the focal points of performances and performance references throughout the novel.

When Calasiris and Chariclea arrive in Memphis, Calasiris shares a recognition scene with his dueling sons.[498] Then, 'there was another addition to the drama' (ἕτερον ἐγίνετο παρεγκύκλημα τοῦ δράματος, 7.7.4). The theatrical term Heliodorus uses, παρεγκύκλημα, seems to relate to a rolling out of the ἐκκύκλημα that interrupts on the action on the stage.[499] Although it is possible that Heliodorus misuses the term,[500] it is more likely that we are the ones who lack the understanding of how the term was used in Heliodorus' time.[501] If the term does refer to an interruption of the onstage action, the term would be appropriate, considering the way that the scene between Chariclea and Theagenes 'interrupts' the reader's 'viewing' of Calasiris' reunion with his sons. In fact, Chariclea's 'entrance' disturbs even Theagenes, who has been an avid spectator of the previous events. When Chariclea tries to make herself known to Theagenes, she stands 'impeding his view of what was happening to Calasiris'

[497] Naturally, their disguises, particularly Calasiris', contain significant Homeric echoes, as does so much of the novel. Feuillâtre (1966: 105-114).
[498] See chapter one. Montiglio (2012: 113-123) examines this recognition scene in depth.
[499] Morgan (1989b: 494 n 172).
[500] Morgan (1989b: 494 n 172).
[501] Walden (1894: 2).

(τῇ θέᾳ τῶν ἀμφὶ Καλάσιριν ἐμποδὼν ἱσταμένην, 7.7.6). He is so intent on the scene before him, and Chariclea so well disguised, that it takes her use of their secret shibboleth—the name 'Pythian' (Πύθιος), and the word 'torch' (λαμπάδιον)—for him to recognise his beloved. As mentioned in chapter two, the crowd is 'enraptured by this miracle of theatrical art' (σκηνογραφικῆς ἐπληροῦτο θαυματουργίας, 7.7.7). Heliodorus congratulates himself for his handling of a scene, and does so using specifically theatrical terms. The previous recognition scene is superseded by that of Chariclea and Theagenes. The combination of παρεγκύκλημα and σκηνογραφικῆς θαυματουργίας encapsulate the moment in theatrical terms.[502] As mentioned in chapter two, in a theatrical kind of contest, Heliodorus' internal audience chooses the love story: 'Turning the city to the sight of themselves more than upon any of the others' (πλέον τῶν ἄλλων εἰς τὴν ἐφ᾽ ἑαυτοὺς θέαν τὴν πόλιν ἐπιστρέφοντες, 7.8.2). This preference need not be a choice of 'tragedy' over 'comedy'. It could be a reflection of the tastes of the time, considering the enormous popularity of the love stories recounted by pantomime or mime.

In Chariton and Xenophon of Ephesus, the reunion of the lovers signals the end of the novel, the portion that Chariton promises will be ἥδιστον and καθάρσιον—'most pleasurable' and 'an antidote' to the previous events of the novel (*Callirhoe* 8.1.4). In Achilles Tatius, the lovers' reunion is near the end of the story, but there are still a few tangles and legal proceedings to overcome before the happy ending. Heliodorus may suggest that the story of Chariclea and Theagenes wins the theatrical prize, but their reunion is not the conclusion of

[502] Walden (1894: 42), Bartsch (1989: 132).

their story. He will place his characters in situations reminiscent of those in Achilles Tatius, though in an expanded, more elaborate format.

Chariclea Among the Ethiopians

When Theagenes and Chariclea arrive as captives in Ethiopia, they discover they are to be human sacrifices in a public religious festival. During their sojourn under Ethiopian custody, Theagenes asks Chariclea to produce the recognition tokens and end their captivity. She argues,

> Εἰ δὲ περιχαρείᾳ τὸ ὅλον ἐνδόντες προχείρως τὰ καθ᾽ ἑαυτοὺς ἐξαγορεύοιμεν, τῶν καὶ γνωρίζειν ταῦτα καὶ βεβαιοῦν δυναμένων οὐ παρόντων, μὴ καὶ λάθωμεν τὸν ἀκούοντα παροξύναντες καὶ πρὸς ὀργήν τι δικαίως ὑφιστάμενοι, χλεύην, ἂν οὕτω τύχῃ, καὶ ὕβριν τὸ πρᾶγμα ἡγησάμενον, εἴ τινες αιχμάλωτοι καὶ δουλεύειν ἀποκεκληρωμένοι πεπλασμένοι καὶ ἀπίθανοι καθάπερ ἐκ μηχανῆς τῷ βασιλεύοντι παῖδας ἑαυτοὺς εἰσποιοῦσιν.
>
> But if we give ourselves over to joy and reveal the truth about ourselves right away, when those who could recognise and confirm our story are not present, then we might unwittingly annoy our hearer and become the objects of his justifiable anger, as he might think the matter some joke or insult if some prisoners destined for slavery to unbelievably, as if brought by the *mêchanê*, have ourselves adopted by the king as his own children. (9.24.6)

Chariclea refuses on the grounds that her audience is not sufficiently prepared, nor her supporting cast assembled. She wants to wait until ‘the time is right’ and each element of the performance is under her control,[503] as she understands how an audience (or hearer) could react to a turn of events that appears like a drama—as unbelievable as a real drama. She fears that their appearance will seem ‘as if brought by the *mêchanê*’ (καθάπερ ἐκ μηχανῆς, 2.8.3). Earlier, Chariclea had voiced disbelief at the appearance of Thisbe and likened her appearance to that of

[503] Heiserman (1977: 196).

the *mêchanê*.[504] Chariclea rejects the conception of their drama as one that can be ended by the implausible solution imposed by means of the *mêchanê.* Is Chariclea contemptuous of an ending that requires such intervention? Heliodorus goes at length at explain that Thisbe's arrival in Egypt is not the work of the *mêchanê*, but the result of her relationship with an Egypt-based merchant. Chariclea, perhaps, voices the author's own disclaimer that his work will not be capped by anything other than a plausible explanation that he has devised from the beginning. This provision is similar to Aristotle's guidelines regarding the *mêchanê* and the intervention of the gods in the *Poetics*. He stipulates that all action within the play should be able to be explained within the bounds of the play: 'There must, however, be nothing inexplicable in the incidents, or, if there is, it must lie outside the tragedy' (ἄλογον δὲ μηδὲν εἶναι ἐν τοῖς πράγμασιν, εἰ δὲ μή, ἔξω τῆς τραγῳδίας).[505] The word *mêchanê* is used four times when Chariclea and Theagenes reach Ethiopia, three times in the final book of the novel (9.24.6, 10.9.5, 10.12.2, 10.39.2).[506] Chariclea's misgivings aside, it would seem Heliodorus would like his reader to think of the *mêchanê* and its implications.

The opening of the novel gave the readers the sense of watching a spectacle from a hillside, with only visual information to guide them on its interpretation. By the end of the novel, the reader is at last in possession of all the facts—except for how the story will end. The aporetic model, appropriate for the beginning of a drama, is replaced, at the end, with a multi-layered spectacle. Now the suspense comes from wondering when exactly Chariclea will reveal her parentage and presumably save her own life. If the average novel reader is conditioned to a generic happy ending, then the reader is in a position similar to

[504] Walden (1894: 43), Bartsch (1989: 133).
[505] Aristotle, *Poetics* 1454b 1-7.
[506] Walden (1894: 43).

the viewer of any mythological fifth-century tragedy. For viewers of fifth-century tragedy, the mythological outlines were more or less set, so the suspense of a production hinged not on events themselves but on the dramatist's handling of them. The question is *how* the hero or heroine will do something, instead of whether they will or not. But the reader discovers that the conclusion is hardly that simple. The protagonists' actions—and the Ethiopian audience's reactions—become the difference between life and death. By now the reader's sympathies lie with the protagonists, and instead of experiencing the final spectacles as an ignorant onlooker, the reader stays by the side of those being watched—Chariclea, Theagenes, and also Persinna and Hydaspes. Where the first scene highlights viewing, the final portion of the novel focuses on the act of performing and of being viewed. The final episode contains multiple layers, which provide various versions of viewing and being viewed. Heliodorus changes focus from intimate interactions to public spectacle, shifting the reader's perspective from audience to actor.

Both must undergo a trial to prove their chastity and make sure they are appropriate virgin sacrifices. The people of Ethiopia, along with the king and queen Hydaspes and Persinna, are well acquainted with their own religious rites, but Chariclea (and the audience) know something they don't—that Chariclea is in fact the long-lost daughter of the king and queen. Chariclea is a conscious actor, in this final scene. She could reveal her identity at any time, but refuses to do so when Theagenes asks her. She says she is waiting for the right moment. Theagenes undergoes the chastity trial, standing on a gridiron that would burn anyone who was not a virgin, and the crowd 'was impressed' (θαυμασθείς, 10.9.1). Theagenes is a spectacle at which to marvel because of his appearance

and his chastity, even though he makes no conscious effort to draw attention. When Theagenes steps down from the iron, he again implores Chariclea to reveal the recognition tokens, but she refuses. Instead, she pulls out her gold-embroidered Delphic robe. She puts it on and lets down her hair before she takes her turn up on the gridiron (10.9.2-3). Her appearance amazes the Ethiopians, as

> εἱστήκει πολὺν χρόνον ἀπαθής, τῷ τε κάλλει τότε πλέον ἐκλάμποντι καταστράπτουσα, περίοπτος ἐφ᾽ ὑψηλοῦ πᾶσι γεγενημένη, καὶ πρὸς τοῦ σχήματος τῆς στολῆς ἀγάλματι θεοῦ πλέον ἢ θνητῇ γυναικὶ προσεικαζομένη. Θάμβος γοῦν ἅμα πάντας κατέσχε· καὶ βοὴν μίαν ἄσημον μὲν καὶ ἄναρθρον δηλωτικὴν δὲ τοῦ θαύματος ἐπήχησαν…
>
> she stood for some time unhurt, dazzling with even greater beauty, visible to all from up on high; due to the fashion of her robe she seemed more like an image of a goddess than a mortal woman. Amazement at once took hold of all, who sounded a single wordless cry, senseless and yet expressive of their astonishment... (10.9.3-4)

Her appearance and her actions—as well as the proof of her virginity—win her the sympathy of the crowd, and of Queen Persinna, who presses her husband to show mercy (10.9.5).[507] It also calls back to her failed execution, the first instance when her innocence appeared to keep her from burning. She stood on the pyre without any injury, and the flames only served to make her appear more beautiful. In this case, Chariclea's purity protects her, but she makes an effort to look stunning. Before the beauty had been an unintended by-product at a time when she was willing to die, but at this point she wishes to save her life. She puts on the robe that she has worn for both a public religious ceremony, like the one in which she is currently a participant, and for her sham wedding feast, which was a performance meant to protect herself and the ones she loves, like her performance now.

[507] Bartsch (1989: 133).

The local sage Sisimisthres disapproves of the sacrifice, and when he attempts to leave the scene and withdraw into the temple, Chariclea makes a second public action. She rushes towards the sage and throws herself at his feet in supplication. Instead of simply begging for her life to be spared, she asks him to judge a lawsuit that she wishes to bring up against the king and queen, that it is not legal for her to be sacrificed. She declares, 'You will learn that it is neither possible nor proper for me to be sacrificed to the gods' (σφαγιασθῆναι γάρ με θεοῖς οὔτε δυνατὸν οὔτε δίκαιον εἶναι μαθήσεσθε, 10.10.2). Chariclea is ready to make a public speech.[508] Her declaration reads like the opening of declaimer's speech, prepared to answer a difficult puzzle through clever expert speaking. Her explanation to Theagenes about waiting until others were there to support her story is made valid by Hydaspes' laughter as he wonders what suit she could have against him. It is Sisimithres' presence that lends her support (10.10.3). As with a professional declaimer, everything depends on not just the content and quality of Chariclea's performance, but on the disposition of her audience.[509]

It is not until Sisimithres, the king, queen and the people have their attention fixed upon her that she begins to offer her trial evidence. This is the third trial described in the novel: the first set in Athens, the second in Egypt and the third in Ethiopia. Cnemon's Athenian trial deals with a combination of adultery mime and the Phaedra myth, characterised like an episode created for sophistic oratory. The outcome of Chariclea's Egyptian trial resonates with martyr narratives and the spectacle of public execution, while the trial itself echoed the self-accusations found in Chariton and Achilles Tatius. The first two court cases were murder trials that featured persuasively weeping female

[508] Pernot (1992: 45).
[509] For example, the sophist Philagrus of Cilicia faces a hostile audience in Philostratus, *VS* 579.

accusers: Demainete's weeping acted as her prosecution against Cnemon, and Arsake wept as she prosecuted Chariclea. In this final trial in Ethiopia, Chariclea takes the centre stage as accuser and witness, and the trial is both a public spectacle, occurring in the midst of religious festival, as well as a private recognition scene.

During the trial, Chariclea reveals the band her mother had left with her. This potential coup de theâtre is reserved only for Persinna and Sisimithres, the only ones who could possibly recognise it—besides the reader, that is. After this initial success, she reveals her mother's necklaces and her father's ring, again personal items recognisable only to a few main characters, and the reader. Chariclea's movements from the moment she enters Ethiopian custody are geared toward this recognition scene. Persinna invites Hydaspes to 'take it and read it. The band will be the instructor of all these things' (λαβὼν δὲ ἀναγίνωσκε· διδάσκαλός σοι πάντων ἡ ταινία γενήσεται, 10.13.2). It is a story the reader has read before, and perhaps this suggestion gives the reader a moment to reflect on the activity that engages them with the novel. In Aristophanes' *Frogs*, the poet is considered a *didaskalos*.[510] The suggestion that drama is didactic is also found in the official title for the public records of dramatic performances in Athens, *Didaskaliai*. Perhaps Chariclea's band, telling the story of her origins, is elevated to the status of a tragic dramatist. Chariclea calls the band 'the story of my fate and the narrative of your lives' (γράμματα δὲ τάδε τύχης τῆς ἐμῆς τε καὶ ὑμῶν διηγήματα, 10.12.4). The story of Chariclea is in many ways the story of the *Aethiopica*, a story encapsulated in the band.[511]

[510] Aristophanes, *Frogs* 1008-1088.
[511] Bowie (1995: 280) and (1998: 18), Hilton (1998), Hunter (1998b: 42), Elmer (2008: 431). Anderson (1997) explores the band's importance within the narrative.

Thus far, the scene she had created, which had begun as conspicuous and public, has turned private. But Hydaspes is not satisfied by the evidence he has read. He wonders,

> Ἢ πόθεν ὅλως ὅτι αὕτη ἐκείνη, καὶ μὴ διέφθαρται μὲν τὸ ἐκτεθὲν τοῖς δὲ γνωρίσμασιν ἐπιτυχών τις ἀποκέχρηται τοῖς ἐκ τῆς τύχης; μή τις δαίμων ἡμῖν ἐπιπαίζει καὶ ὥσπερ προσωπεῖον τῇ κόρῃ ταῦτα περιθεὶς ἐντρυφᾷ τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ περὶ τεκνοποιΐαν ἐπιθυμίᾳ?
>
> how can we be sure that this is she, that the child did not die after being abandoned and someone happened upon the tokens of recognition and that some daimon has not sported with us and our great desire to have children, bestowing the tokens on this girl and using her as a kind of mask, preying on our desire for children? (10.13.5)[512]

He voices the questions that recognition tokens could raise in the minds of more practical readers and audience members, similar objections as those listed in Euripides' *Electra,* which are in themselves intertextual, recalling the recognition tokens the Aeschylean Electra does not question.[513] It could be that Heliodorus, as an extremely sophisticated dramatist-author, looks down on the all-too-easy, cheap and run-of-the-mill ways of *anagnorisis* that playwrights have at their disposal. Euripides' *Electra* would, in all likelihood, even in Heliodorus' time, be the emblematic case of doubting a plethora of recognition tokens. The daimon that Hydaspes mentions could be a self-conscious reference to the role of the author, who has in fact stage-managed Chariclea and her important belongings throughout the novel.

Hydaspes' misgivings about the written proof and the personal belongings turn the recognition scene from a private to a public one. Sisimithres cites as visual evidence a painting of a white Andromeda that Persinna looked upon at the moment of Chariclea's conception, which led to the girl's exact resemblance

[512] Walden (1894: 42) does not list this instance in his discussion of the term προσωπεῖον.
[513] Euripides, *Electra* 515-545; Aeschylus, *Choephoroi* 167-234. Heiserman (1977: 198).

to the heroine.[514] The entire crowd recognises that the painting and Chariclea are mirror images; yet further proof is provided by a birthmark on the girl's arm.[515] Heliodorus, ever over-the-top, offers a trial, a band, multiple necklaces, a ring, a painting and a birthmark, as well as the verbal testimony of Persinna and Sisimithres. The visual proofs serve to inform the ignorant Ethiopian crowd, while the verbal ones are reserved for the Greek-speaking main characters, and the reader. The reader stays on the inside of this scene, looking out at a wider audience, instead of in.[516] Heliodorus describes the crowd as they are when Hydaspes views them,

> ἐπιστὰς τὸν τε δῆμον κατοπτεύσας ἀπὸ τῶν ἴσων παθῶν κεκινημένον καὶ πρὸς τὴν σκηνοποιΐαν τῆς τύχης ὑφ᾽ ἡδονῆς τε ἅμα καὶ ἐλέου δακρύοντας
>
> standing and watching his people, agitated with emotions equal to his own, and who cried out, weeping from both pleasure and pity at the stage management of destiny/Tyche (10.16.3)

Heliodorus describes his story as the 'the stage-management of fate/Tyche' (σκηνοποιΐαν τῆς τύχης).[517] The reader sees the audience from the viewpoint of someone subject to their gaze. The audience shares the emotions of the one they view, and the reason for the feelings is described in theatrical terms.

The surfeit of recognition proofs and their drawn out examination both recalls and outdoes Electra's scepticism of the recognition tokens in Euripides' *Electra*. Heliodorus' scene expands and explodes the tragic and comic conventions of recognition, as it folds the events into a larger context and spectacle. The recognition scene does not provide a happy resolution to the story,

[514] Andromeda is also described as white in Philostratus' *Imagines* (1.29) and Achilles Tatius (3.7.4).
[515] The physical sign on her skin recall's Odysseus' scar, which reveals him to Eurykleia (*Odyssey* 19.455ff).
[516] 'Although the identification of the reader and audience predominates throughout this sequence, the relationship is neither simple nor static', Morgan (1992: 93).
[517] Walden (1894: 42), Bartsch (1989: 133).

as occurs in New Comedy and in the Greek novel *Daphnis and Chloe*.[518] For a reader accustomed to the theatrical convention, this is a twist that could shatter expectations of a swift conclusion. The process does not involve Theagenes at all, nor does it instantly resolve the issue at hand—his and Chariclea's imminent sacrifice. Although Hydaspes does recognise Chariclea as his daughter (10.16.4), he maintains that he must continue with the religious ceremony at hand and sacrifice her to the god of Meroe (10.17.4-10). For a moment it seems as if Chariclea's grand performance has all been for naught, except to heighten the *pathos* of the scene—a father, reunited with a long-lost child, must lose her again. Hydaspes addresses his subjects, then his daughter, then the gods,

> Καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν ὁ μὲν ἐπέβαλλε τῇ Χαρικλείᾳ τὰς χεῖρας, ἄγειν μὲν ἐπὶ τοὺς βωμοὺς καὶ τὴν ἐπ᾽ αὐτῶν πυρκαιὰν ἐνδεικνύμενος πλείονι δὲ αὐτὸς πυρὶ τῷ πάθει τὴν καρδίαν σμυχόμενος καὶ τὴν ἐπιτυχίαν τῶν ἐνηδρευμένων τῇ δημηγορίᾳ λόγων ἀπευχόμενος.
>
> saying these things, he put his hands on Chariclea and making a show to lead her towards the altars and the fire that burned on them, though the fire in his own heart was smouldering hotter than any fire. And he prayed against his especially aimed words in his oration carrying their point. (10.17.1)

In contrast to the aporetic opening scene, it appears that by the end of the novel the narrator's initial un-omniscient cover is blown, but perhaps this is a stylistic choice for dramatic effect. Heliodorus reveals Hydaspes' inner thoughts and intentions—though only after the speech that dismantles a reader's expectations of a swift and happy conclusion. This relatively rare 'slip' into omniscience is required for the audience to understand that not only is Hydaspes *not* a heartless monster capable of sacrificing his daughter, he has, instead, said these very words to save her. He may serve as a contrast to the famous figure of Agamemnon, who does sacrifice his daughter Iphigenia. Given the popularity of

[518] Fusillo (1991: 52), Dworacki (1996: 360), Crismani (1997: 112).

Iphigenia plays in antiquity,[519] it is possible that a reader would recognise Hydaspes' predicament as an echo of Agamemnon's; however, it is not strictly necessary for the narrative. The choice to let the readers in signifies the shift in the novel's focus from the viewer to the one being viewed. Without the additional information on his intent, the reader would not know that he had been *acting*, playing a role in order to manipulate the emotions of the crowd and stir them into action. The same kind of inside look allows the reader to understand Chariclea's calm reaction to the news that Theagenes will still be sacrificed. She wants to cry out, but instead

> μόγις δ᾽οὖν τὸ συμφέρον τιθεμένη καὶ πρὸς τὸ ἐκμανὲν τοῦ πάθους διὰ τὸ χρειῶδες ἐγκαρτερῆσαι βιασαμένη πάλιν ὑφεῖρπε τὸν σκοπὸν
>
> it was with some difficulty that she restrained herself out of necessity and forced herself to subdue her emotions to the demands of her situation. Once more she crept toward her goal (10.19.1)

Again Heliodorus tells the reader why a character reacts as they do. Here, with the mention of Chariclea's σκοπός, her goal, it is clear that Chariclea is acting for a purpose. The πάλιν emphasises that this is what she has been doing for the entire scene. These insights bring the reader into the actor's world, and further separate the reader from the internal audience. The reader watches the audience from the actor's perspective, instead of watching 'through' the audience.

Chariclea tells her whole story to her mother, in private, and it is Persinna who intercedes and tells Hydaspes that Theagenes and Chariclea are engaged. In Chariton and Achilles Tatius, the male protagonists are given the opportunity to retell their adventures towards the end of the narrative, Chaereas to the citizens of Syracuse and Clitophon to Leucippe's father. In Heliodorus, there is no public announcement of the trials and tribulations of the protagonists, and yet the story

[519] P.Oxy 413. See Hall (2010) and (2013a: esp. 134-162).

still becomes a form of entertainment.[520] Winkler observes that the scene in some ways resembles the *Charition* mime, as both contain 'crowds of black foreigners shouting a strange language, a great king, and a heroine in danger.'[521] Chariclea and Theagenes' situation does on the surface resemble *Charition*'s 'foreigners in a foreign land' motif, as well as its possible source story, that of Iphigenia in Aulis *and* Tauris.

Chariclea and her parents speak in Greek, while the crowd understands Ethiopian, but language is little barrier to the spectacle before them.

> Ὁ δῆμος ἐτέρωθεν σὺν εὐφήμοις ταῖς βοαῖς ἐξεχόρευε, πᾶσα ἡλικία καὶ τύχη συμφώνως τὰ γινόμενα θυμηδοῦντες, τὰ μὲν πλεῖστα τῶν λεγομένων οὐ συνιέντες, τὰ ὄντα δὲ ἐκ τῶν προγεγονότων ἐπὶ τῇ Χαρικλείᾳ συμβάλλοντες, ἢ τάχα καὶ ἐξ ὁρμῆς θείας ἢ σύμπαντα ταῦτα ἐσκηνογράφησεν εἰς ὑπόνοιαν τῶν ἀληθῶν ἐλθόντες. Ὑφ᾽ ἧς καὶ τὰ ἐναντιώτατα πρὸς συμφωνίαν ἡρμόζετο
>
> The people on their part exulted with shouts of congratulation; people of all ages and situations rejoiced in unison over the turn of events. Most of what was being said they could not understand; but they pieced together the facts from what had previously happened regarding Chariclea; or came to a suspicion of the truth through a divine impulse who had designed the entire scene, and by whose means extreme contraries were joined together in concord. (10.38.3-4)

Heliodorus presents two explanations for how the crowd understands, in what Winkler calls a Heliodoran 'amphiboly'.[522] The first explanation gives a realistic idea of how an audience may attempt to comprehend a performance in an unfamiliar language. The ability to understand a performance without understanding the speech recalls the capabilities of pantomime, which Lucian characterises as a universal language capable of transcending linguistic barriers.[523] Chariclea saves her lover and earns her birthright while winning over

[520] Winkler (1982: 155) calls the Ethiopians the 'audience of the Chariclea-mime'.
[521] Winkler (1982: 155 n 62).
[522] Winkler (1982: 114), Bartsch (1989: 134).
[523] Lucian, *De Salt*. 63, 69 and esp. 64.

a foreign crowd by using techniques that recall a variety of performance genres. Winkler highlights the improvisational qualities of Calasiris.[524] These can be seen in Chariclea as well.[525] She does not conform to a single genre but instead seems to draw inspiration from her circumstances.

Conclusion

Chariclea and her story are integral to the text, and can even stand for the text. David Elmer claims that in her unusual conception and multiple father figures, Chariclea 'embodies the very nature of the work as a densely inter-textual engagement with past writers.'[526] If this is the case, then I would broaden the intertextual engagement to include live performance, so often embodied in the father-figure Calasiris. His arrival in Delphi is the beginning of her adventures and also the beginning of her education in performance. Chariclea shows a clear progression in her powers as a performer, from a natural talent to a contriver of premeditated spectacles. Performance, at first a duty, becomes something in which she takes pleasure (as when she and Calasiris dress as beggars) and, more importantly, becomes a skill crucial to not only her self-advancement but also her survival. Chariclea's Protean ability to turn herself into the right character to suit every situation seems to reflect the novel's best recognised performer, Calasiris. It is Calasiris who claims that she is 'ready to turn a situation to her advantage' (5.26.2-3). To do so, she draws on performance genres from both ends of the cultural spectrum, from the high-flown rhetoric of the law court to the improvisation of mime.

[524] Winkler (1982).
[525] Heiserman (1977: 197).
[526] Elmer (2008: 432).

It is perhaps no accident that many of Chariclea's most theatrical moments occur when she is wearing her Delphic gown—in the opening scene (explained in detail later by Calasiris), in the *ekphrasis* of the religious procession at Delphi, and in the novel's spectacular conclusion. The dress becomes a weapon in her theatrical arsenal, a costume that awes her audience. Her bow, another ornament from Delphi, also becomes a prop—serving as a staff in Calasiris' beggar disguise. The bow also reflects the dangers of not recognising a performance and the dangerous ground between seeming and being. The pirates believe the bow is simply an ornament, but Chariclea puts it to use with deadly effect (5.31.2, 5.32.3).

The end of the novel serves as a contrast and a complement to the aporetic beginning of the novel. Chariclea, initially an unnamed, tragic-style character, is by the end of the novel very much a known quantity, though still an actress. The action of the novel concludes with a public procession complete with torches, music, and chariots, all heading towards Meroe where Chariclea and Theagenes will be married (10.41.3). The torches and music can recall the conclusion of a dramatic performance, particularly comedy, with torches, music and dancing.[527] The final image also may bring to a reader's mind the narrator's omniscient comments from the end of book eight, regarding the couple's future status as rulers (8.17.5). Their entrance into Ethiopian custody is described as resembling the beginning of a dramatic production. The fulfillment of the narrator's prophetic statement is coupled with an ending that resembles a production's conclusion.

[527] Winkler (1982: 153), Bartsch (1989: 134), Fusillo (1991: 53-54), Dworacki (1996: 357-358).

5. Leucippe's Deaths

Introduction

Leucippe and Clitophon's time in Egypt is punctuated not only by Leucippe's two spectacular *Scheintode* but also by Clitophon's reactions to them. Although Clitophon repeatedly reflects on how he can use words and actions to manipulate his fellows,[528] he plays an even larger role as a spectator, especially in narrating his experience of watching Leucippe's two Egyptian death scenes (3.15.1-6, 5.7.4-5). Clitophon's description of Leucippe's deaths from his own 'restricted viewpoint' eventually leads to an 'awareness of the continual play of deception and discovery' within the novel.[529] Clitophon is repeatedly hoodwinked into believing his beloved is dead, only to learn the truth at a later date (3.18.2-3.21.5, 8.16.1-3). While Clitophon undergoes a theatrical experience as a spectator, Leucippe and her 'murderers' utilise both stage props and costumes to portray plausible death scenes. For both death scenes, the reader first encounters Clitophon's response to the performance and then only much later receives an explanation of how the effect was achieved—in a sense, experiencing the scenes from both an 'audience' and a 'behind-the-scenes' perspective. Clitophon does not know the deaths are performances, although experienced novel readers probably would have doubted that the heroine would be killed off,[530] but neither Clitophon nor the reader would know how Leucippe could have survived until the 'big reveal'. Clitophon and Leucippe's experiences in Egypt engage with a broad variety of contemporary performance genres,

[528] See chapter three.
[529] Bartsch (1989: 128-129). For further on Clitophon's ego-narrative see Reardon (1994). Whitmarsh (2011: 82-85) nicely lays out the 'deliciously complex' layers of voices in the text.
[530] Morales (2004: 168), Whitmarsh (2011: 208).

including mime and tragic burlesque. Menelaus and Satyrus quite literally borrow from a Homerist, using his props in their own performance.

Graham Anderson, Shadi Bartsch and Helen Morales have brought attention to the status of Achilles Tatius' readers as 'erotic voyeurs' of Clitophon's narration.[531] Naturally, this makes Clitophon himself an 'erotic voyeur', as it is through his eyes that the readers experience these images, and his reactions mediate those of the readers.[532] The language Clitophon uses to describe Leucippe's *Scheintode* places him in the same position as a theatrical audience—experiencing the range of emotions at which a dramatist aims. The staged violence and the voyeuristic quality of Clitophon's narration are reminiscent of the performances found in the arena or on the Roman stage, like the Laureolus mime, which I will discuss later in this chapter.

Clitophon among his Captors

After Leucippe and Clitophon wash ashore in Egypt, they fall into the hands of the *boukoloi*, Egyptian bandits (3.9.2-3).[533] In the night, Clitophon laments over the fate in store for Leucippe. His speech constitutes most of a chapter and includes a reflection on the power of speech:

> Λῃστὴν γὰρ Ἕλληνα καὶ φωνὴ κατέκλασε καὶ δέησις ἐμάλαξεν· ὁ γὰρ λόγος πολλάκις τὸν ἔλεον προξενεῖ· τὸ γὰρ πονοῦν τῆς ψυχῆς ἡ γλῶττα διακονουμένη πρὸς ἱκετηρίαν τῆς τῶν ἀκουόντων ψυχῆς ἡμεροῖ τὸ θυμούμενον. νῦν δὲ ποίᾳ μὲν φωνῇ δεηθῶμεν; τίνας δὲ ὅρκους προτείνωμεν; κἂν Σειρήνων τις γένηται πιθανώτερος, ὁ ἀνδροφόνος οὐκ ἀκούει. μόνοις ἱκετεύειν με δεῖ τοῖς νεύμασι καὶ τὴν δέησιν δηλοῦν ταῖς χειρονομίαις. ὢ τῶν ἀτυχημάτων· ἤδη τὸν θρῆνον ὀρχήσομαι.

[531] Anderson (1982), Bartsch (1989: 158), Morales (2004: 166).
[532] Anderson (1982: 24), Marinčič (2007: 185). Morales (2004: 166) calls Clitophon an 'optical orgiast'.
[533] For an in-depth look as banditry in the Roman Empire, see Shaw (1984) and Hooff (1988). For bandits in the novel see Hopwood (1998).

> For our voice might break down a Greek bandit, a prayer might soften him; for speech often brings on pity; the tongue, serving the pain of the soul in supplication, taming the raging of the listener's mind. But now in what language should we pray? What oaths should we offer? One could be more persuasive than the Sirens, but the murderer would not listen; I have to supplicate with signs only and express my prayers by hand-gestures. Alas for my misfortunes; at this point I will dance out my funeral dirge. (3.10.2-3)

His speech echoes and adds a layer of complication to the famous words of Gorgias on the power of *logos*.[534] Certainly speech has great power, but only if your hearers speak your language.[535] A *pepaideumenos* reader of this part of the novel could recognise this 'high literature' point of reference, while also appreciating the references to a contemporary genre that was characterised by gestures instead of words. Anderson characterises this moment as an example of how Achilles Tatius is able 'to qualify the most bombastic lovers' rhetoric with bathetic effects', as he believes that Clitophon presents his funeral dirge as a 'mime'.[536] Anderson does not distinguish between mime and pantomime, but more recent research on pantomime and its silent dancers would suggest that Clitophon's description of silent signs and hand-gestures, and his intention to dance (ὀρχήσομαι) is an allusion to pantomime, not mime.[537] The syntax of ὀρχέομαι (or *saltare* in Latin) and an accusative is a typical formula used for the

[534] Gorgias, *Hel.* 8, 'Discourse is a great potentate, which by the smallest and most secret body accomplishes the most divine works; for it can stop fear and assuage pain and produce joy and make mercy abound' (λόγος δυνάστης μέγας ἐστίν, ὃς σμικροτάτῳ σώματι καὶ ἀφανεστάτῳ θειότατα ἔργα ἀποτελεῖ· δύναται γὰρ καὶ φόβον παῦσαι καὶ λύπην ἀφελεῖν καὶ χαρὰν ἐνεργάσασθαι καὶ ἔλεον ἐπαυξῆσαι).

[535] The challenge of communication between speakers of different languages plays a role in all the novels, especially Heliodorus. See Saïd (1992).

[536] Anderson (1982: 26). Anderson assumes that a reference to mime or pantomime must be 'bathetic'. Pantomime shared much of repertoire with tragedy, and pantomime performances could be genuinely pathetic and emotional. High culture references do not have to be serious, and 'popular culture' references do not have to be comic.

[537] Lada-Richards (2007), Hall and Wyles (2008), Webb (2008). Naturally, pantomimes were adept at 'speaking' through gesture. In reference to their hand gestures, Lucian describes pantomime artists as 'handiwise' (χειρισόφους, Lucian, *De Salt.* 69). See chapter one.

topics of pantomime.[538] Like a pantomime dancer, Clitophon contemplates using his body and hands for speech.[539] Lucian recounts the tale of a barbarian from Pontus who understood a pantomime dancer's story without understanding the words sung by the chorus, and wanted to bring the dancer back to his own country to use him like an interpreter to communicate with neighbouring peoples who spoke another language.[540] A reader may have immediately compared Clitophon's attempts to convey his distress in a language his 'barbarian' captors could understand to the silent speech of pantomime dancers. The bandits declare that Leucippe will be taken as a virgin sacrifice (3.12.1-2). While Leucippe is being prepared for the ritual, an Egyptian cavalry regiment attacks the group of bandits and Clitophon finds himself in their custody. He watches Leucippe's sacrifice in the company of his new captors.

Leucippe's First *Scheintod*

Clitophon recounts that the army's camp and the robber's camp are separated by a trench, over which he witnesses Leucippe's sacrifice:

> βωμὸς δέ τις αὐτοῖς αὐτοσχέδιος ἦν πηλοῦ πεποιημένος καὶ σορὸς τοῦ βωμοῦ πλησίον. ἄγουσι δή τινες δύο τὴν κόρην, ὀπίσω τὼ χεῖρε δεδεμένην· καὶ αὐτοὺς μὲν οἵτινες ἦσαν οὐκ εἶδον, ἦσαν γὰρ ὡπλισμένοι, τὴν δὲ κόρην Λευκίππην οὖσαν ἐγνώρισα. εἶτα κατὰ τῆς κεφαλῆς σπονδὴν περιχέαντες, περιάγουσι τὸν βωμὸν κύκλῳ καὶ ἐπηύλει τις αὐτῇ, καὶ ὁ ἱερεύς ᾖδεν, ὡς εἰκός, ᾠδὴν Αἰγυπτίαν· τὸ γὰρ σχῆμα τοῦ στόματος, καὶ τῶν προσώπων τὸ διειλκυσμένον ὑπέφαινεν ᾠδήν. εἶτα ἀπὸ συνθήματος πάντες ἀναχωροῦσι τοῦ βωμοῦ μακράν· τῶν δὲ νεανίσκων ὁ ἕτερος ἀνακλίνας αὐτὴν ὑπτίαν, ἔδησεν ἐκ παττάλων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐρηρεισμένων, οἷον ποιοῦσιν οἱ κοροπλάθοι τὸν Μαρσύαν ἐκ τοῦ φυτοῦ δεδεμένον· εἶτα λαβὼν ξίφος βάπτει κατὰ τῆς καρδίας καὶ διελκύσας τὸ ξίφος εἰς τὴν κάτω γαστέρα ῥήγνυσι· τὰ σπλάγχνα δὲ εὐθὺς ἐξεπήδησεν, ἃ ταῖς χερσὶν

[538] Kokolakis (1959: 12 n 19), Panayotakis (2008: 187 n 6). Kokolakis provides a number of examples of this formula.
[539] Lucian, *De Salt.* 69 and 63; Cassiodorus, *Var*. 4.51.9. See also Lada-Richards (2007), Webb (2008: 72-77), Lada-Richards (2013: 123-124, 137 n 102).
[540] Lucian, *De Salt.* 64.

> ἐξελκύσαντες ἐπιτιθέασι τῷ βωμῷ, καὶ ἐπεὶ ὠπτήθη, κατατεμόντες ἅπαντες εἰς μοίρας ἔφαγον. ταῦτα δὲ ὁρῶντες οἱ στρατιῶται καὶ ὁ στρατηγὸς καθ᾽ ἕν τῶν πραττομένων ἀνεβόων καὶ τὰς ὄψεις ἀπέστρεφον τῆς θέας, ἐγὼ δὲ ἐκ παραλόγου καθήμενος ἐθεώμην. τὸ δὲ ἦν ἔκπληξις· μέτρον γὰρ οὐκ ἔχον τὸ κακὸν ἐνεβρόντησέ με.
>
> There was also an improvised altar made of mud and a coffin near the altar. Then two men led the girl, her hands tied behind her back. I could not see who they were, since they were in battle dress, but I recognised the girl as Leucippe. Then having poured a libation over her head, they led her round the altar in a circle, while someone played a pipe and a priest chanted, it seemed, an Egyptian hymn, for the movements of his lips and the contortions of his features suggested a song. Then, at a concerted signal, everyone went some distance away from the altar; one of the two youths laid her down on her back, and strapped her with pegs fixed to the ground, just as the statues show Marsyas fastened to the tree. Then, taking a sword, he plunged it in near the heart, drawing it down to the lower belly, opening up her body; straightaway her innards gushed out, which they, drawing them forth in their hands, placed upon the altar; and when they were roasted, everyone cut them up into shares and ate them. The general and the soldiers watching cried out at these doings and turned their eyes away from the sight, but I, contrary to all expectation, sat watching. It was an utter shock. The boundless calamity struck me like lightning. (3.15.1-6)

Achilles Tatius adopts a Heliodorus-like distance in relating the scene, keeping to an eyewitness form of description without any supplementary information beyond his own emotional reactions and those of other viewers.[541] Clitophon thinks the priest is singing in Egyptian from the visual evidence at his disposal. The lack of omniscient narration is perhaps easier to achieve in the first-person narrator of Clitophon than it is via Heliodorus' third-person narrator. The result is similar to that of Heliodorus' aporetic opening scene: Leucippe's sacrifice unfolds the way that it would for an immediate viewer, providing the reader with a vicarious viewing experience akin to live performance. Clitophon provides two different audience reactions—the general and his men, who look away, and his own. He cannot stop looking. Clitophon is the ultimate voyeur, made all the

[541] Bartsch (1989: 128-129), Reardon (1994: 82-84), Haynes (2003: 58).

more clear by the contrast with his fellow viewers. Leucippe, who had been a visual feast in book one, is now a literal feast, still consumed visually by Clitophon.[542]

Death scenes appear to have been popular in mime and pantomime.[543] Mignogna suggests that the phrase τὸ γὰρ σχῆμα τοῦ στόματος reflects a technical term that describes the expression of a pantomime actor, as mentioned in Lucian.[544] Leucippe's death is graphically violent, with the added horror of apparent cannibalism. The appeal for a 'viewer' may at first seem difficult to comprehend, but horror films continue to grace contemporary movie screens. Katherine Coleman uses an example from Plato to show the war between revulsion and fascination was just as potent in antiquity: Leontios covers his eyes at the sight of executed corpses in Athens, but when curiosity overcomes him he tells his eyes to look their fill, exclaiming, 'look... oh wretches, be filled with this fine sight' (ἰδοὺ ... ὦ κακοδαίμονες, ἐμπλήσθητε τοῦ καλοῦ θεάματος).[545] Leucippe's sacrifice is presented as a θέα, a spectacle, like the theatrical deaths staged in the arena discussed by Coleman.[546] Criminals could play the role of Hercules, Orpheus, Daedalus, Attis or Pasiphae.[547] Morales claims Leucippe's false deaths resemble the '"snuff" mime' of Laureolus, and Mignogna agrees that the scene resembles '*una sorta di pantomima dal fascino sinistro*'.[548] Although in Clitophon's description he compares the way her body has been bound to various statues of Marsyas, that does not mean that a statue would be a reader's

[542] Morales (2004: 169).
[543] Libanius, *Or.* 64.110. See chapter one.
[544] Lucian, *De Salt.* 10; cf. Mignogna (1997: 230 n 16), Morales (2004: 168).
[545] Plato, *Republic* 440a; Coleman (1990: 60-73).
[546] Crismani (1997: 80-82) suggests that Leucippe's sacrifice resembles New Comedy.
[547] Tertullian, *Apol.* 15. 4-5; Martial, *Lib. Spect.* 5, 8, 21. See Coleman (1990: 60-64).
[548] Elsom (1992), Mignogna (1997: 230), Morales (2004: 72, 168). While I think that there was possibly much more to the Laureolus mime than its violence, it is fair to say that death was compelling theatrical fare, see Plass (1995), Junkelmann (2000).

only potential model for the myth. The flaying of Marsyas could have been an appropriate myth to re-enact in the arena. In addition, pantomime dancers were compared to statues and paintings, as well as sculptors and painters.[549] A series of decorative panels from the House of Apollo (also called House of A. Herennuleius Communis) may depict a pantomime dancer in three successive roles—Minerva, Apollo, and Marsyas—in what could have been a performance of the Marsyas myth.[550]

The theatrical audience's shock and awe is embodied in the term *ekplexis* (ἔκπληξις). Clitophon's response to the scene and his inability to move or look away further underline the scene as a harrowing but engrossing spectacle. The term *ekplexis* held a range of connotations. In Thucydides and Gorgias it is a 'blow to the wits or a shock', a disturbance of the psyche that can trigger physical and emotional reactions.[551] *Ekplexis* was also an important element of both theatrical and ritual performance. Gorgias is said to have astonished (ἐξέπληξε) the Athenians with his style and Socrates in Plato's *Symposium* asks who would not be astonished (τίς οὐκ ἂν ἐξεπλάγη) by the previous speaker.[552] Plato mentions in the *Ion* that rhapsodic performances can produce *ekplexis* in their audiences.[553] The term also held a place in tragedy, often with a great emotional effect. Aristotle uses the term several times, once in reference to an *anagnorisis*, and both Aristotle and Longinus claims *ekplexis* is the *telos* of poetry.[554] Plutarch, in turn, connects *ekplexis* with the aim of poets, which is to

[549] Lucian, *De Salt.* 35; Aristaenetus, *Letters* 1.26, 7-11; Plotinus, *Enneads* 5.9.11; Libanius, *Or.* 64.118.
[550] Wall painting 6.7.23, Bieber (1961: 232-233 with fig. 776), Moorman (1983: 84-90 with fig. 12), Hall (2008a: 12-13 with fig 0.2).
[551] Hunter (1986: 418, 415-421), Lada-Richards (1993: 127 n 28), Whitmarsh (2011: 208).
[552] See test. A 4 (3) D-K, Plato, *Sym.* 198b; Lada-Richards (1993: 127 n 27).
[553] Plato, *Ion* 535b.
[554] Aristotle, *Poetics* 1454a4. On ἔκπληξις as the *telos* of poetry, see Aristotle, *Poetics* 1460b25, Ps. Longinus, *Subl.* 15.2.

produce pleasure.[555] He also uses the word παράλογος, unexpected, in his explanation of how to produce *ekplexis*.[556] In Clitophon's speech, he also uses the word, though to describe his reaction to the event, not the event itself. He becomes a component of the 'textbook' experience of shock and awe.

In the night, Clitophon goes to Leucippe's coffin, intending to kill himself. He is stopped by the arrival of Menelaus and Satyrus, who have survived the shipwreck and fallen in with the Egyptian bandits. Menelaus takes the opportunity to 'perform' a bit of necromancy, telling him:

> «Λευκίππη δέ σοι νῦν ἀναβιώσεται» βλέψας οὖν πρὸς αὐτόν, «Ἔτι μου καταγελᾷς;» ἔφην...δίς που καὶ τρὶς ἐπάταξε τὴν σορόν, καὶ κάτωθεν φωνῆς ἀκούω καὶ πάνυ λεπτῆς. τρόμος οὖν εὐθὺς ἴσχει με καὶ πρὸς τὸν Μενέλαον ἀπέβλεπον, μάγον εἶναι δοκῶν. ὁ δὲ ἤνοιγεν ἅμα τὴν σορὸν καὶ ἡ Λευκίππη κάτωθεν ἀνέβαινε, φοβερὸν θέαμα, ὦ θεοί, καὶ φρικωδέστατον. ἀνέῳκτο μὲν αὐτῆς ἡ γαστὴρ ἅπασα καὶ ἦν ἐντέρων κενή· ἐπιπεσοῦσα δέ περιπλέκεται μοι
>
> 'your Leucippe will now at once live again.' Looking at him, I said 'Do you still mock me,' ... he knocked on the coffin two or three times, and I heard a very faint voice come from beneath; a shudder instantly took hold of me, and I looked at Menelaus, thinking him a wizard; at the same moment he opened the coffin, and Leucippe came out from below— an awful and most terrifying sight, by gods. Her entire belly was ripped open and was empty of all its entrails, but falling upon me she embraced me (3.17.4-7)

A μάγος is a magician,[557] but the context suggests that Menelaus is less of a magician and more of a showman.[558] Perhaps he resembles a genre of performers called *magoidoi*, though this is a difficult proposition to prove, as there is little known about these performers.[559] His performance may also recall those of the

[555] Plutarch, *Moralia* 16a-17e. See Heath (1987: 15-16) for further on ἔκπληξις.
[556] Plutarch, *How a young man should listen to poetry* 25d, cf. Whitmarsh (2011: 205, 208).
[557] Seen in Sophocles, *Oedipus Tyrannus* 387; Aeschylus, *Orestes* 1498; Plato, *Republic* 572e; Lucian, *Asin.* 4. O'Sullivan (1980: 243) gives the definition of μάγος as 'wizard'.
[558] Laplace (2007: 400-410) sees allusions to Chariton in Leucippe's *Scheintode*.
[559] Strabo 14.1.41; Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 14.620a-621f; cf. Hunter (2002: 196). See also Nicoll (1931).

thaumatopoioi, 'miracle-workers' or 'wonder-makers'.[560] The situation of a person ascending from below (κάτωθεν ἀνέβαινε) and the mention of a θέαμα φρικωδέστατον also resonate with mystery cult rituals.[561] Perhaps this is, in part, a parody of ritual initiation.

Clitophon is amazed and confused, unsure if Leucippe is truly alive. Menelaus assures him that she is:

> «τὰ σπλάγχνα ἀπολήψεται καὶ τὰ στέρνα συμφύσεται, καὶ ἄτρωτον ὄψει. ἀλλ᾽ ἐπικάλυψαί σου τὸ πρόσωπον· καλῶ γὰρ τὴν Ἑκάτην ἐπὶ τὸ ἔργον.» ἐγὼ δὲ πιστεύσας ἐνεκαλυψάμην. ὁ δὲ ἄρχεται τερατεύεσθαι καὶ λόγον τινὰ καταλέγειν· καὶ ἅμα λέγων περιαιρεῖ τὰ ἐπὶ τῇ γαστρὶ μαγγανεύματα τῆς Λευκίππης καὶ ἀποκατέστησεν εἰς τὸ ἀρχαῖον, λέγει μοι, «Ἀποκάλυψαι.» καὶ ἐγὼ μόλις μὲν καὶ φοβούμενος (ἀληθῶς γὰρ ᾤμην τὴν Ἑκάτην παρεῖναι) ὅμως δ᾽ οὖν ἀπέστησα τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν τὰς χεῖρας καὶ ὁλόκληρον τὴν Λευκίππην ὁρῶ.
>
> 'she will get her entrails back, her breast will reseal, and you shall see her whole. But cover your face, for I am going to invoke Hecate for the task.' Believing him, I covered myself, and he began to conjure and to utter some speech; and as he was speaking he removed the deceptive contrivances off of Leucippe's belly and restored it as it was before. Then he said to me, 'Uncover yourself'; with hesitation and fear (for I truly thought that Hecate was there), nevertheless I removed my hands from my eyes and saw Leucippe whole. (3.18.2-5)

Clitophon is astonished (ἐκπλαγεὶς, 3.18.5). As above, a term with theatrical (and ritual) connotations is used to describe Clitophon's response to a spectacle he witnesses. In a sense, this second use of the term retroactively activates the theatrical connotations of Clitophon's initial ἔκπληξις. The shocking spectacle of Leucippe's sacrifice was in fact a performance.

[560] Dickie (2001: 601), Lada-Richards (2007: 31).
[561] Aelius Aristides 22.2 calls the Eleusinian mysteries 'the most horrible and most joyful' (φρικωδέστατόν τε καὶ φαιδρότατον) of human experiences. For the most thorough investigation of the relationship between religious initiation and the novel, see Merkelbach (1962).

Sham death and resurrection are the culminating points of initiatory ritual, which place the episode in the frame of cultic activity.[562] In keeping with the theme of ritual and performance are the eminently contentious scenes of dancing found in the 'Villa of the Mysteries' in Pompeii, which could be representations of pantomime-like performances enacted during Dionysiac mystery cult rituals.[563] The scenes have also been interpreted as a pantomime performance that recounts episodes regarding the god Dionysus.[564] The 'resurrection' scene brings to mind the kinds of *Scheintode* that seem to have occurred in mime. The *Moicheutria* appears to include false death, and Plutarch mentions a mime hypothesis with a drugged dog that appears to come back to life.[565] Menelaus has put on a brief, teasing show, pretending to be able to raise and heal the dead. He calls on Hecate, as does the old Egyptian woman in Heliodorus when she raises her dead son.[566] There is a clear difference in tone between the two necromancy scenes. In Heliodorus the scene reflects the kind of 'wisdom of Egypt' that Calasiris deplores.[567] In Achilles Tatius, Menelaus seems to poke fun at the same Greek expectations about Egyptian magic that Calasiris does when he hoodwinks Charicles and puts on a charlatan act for Chariclea.[568] Menelaus and Calasiris both put on performances that have a different significance for the reader than for the spectators within the novels. In Heliodorus, Calasiris makes clear that he intends to trick Charicles. In Achilles Tatius, the reader probably would assume that all is not as it appears, especially when Clitophon describes an action that occurs when his eyes are closed—the

[562] Burkert (1983), Lada-Richards (1999: 57-60, 103-108).
[563] Moorman (1983: esp. 75, 114-117), Gallistl (1995: esp. 1-3, abb. 1b).
[564] Bastet (1974: esp. 222, 238-240, with fig. 1).
[565] Plutarch, *de soll. An.* 19.
[566] Heliodorus 6.14-15.
[567] Heliodorus 3.16.
[568] Heliodorus 4.5.3-4.

removal of the ‘deceptive contrivances’. At that point, the reader becomes aware that the ‘necromancy’ is an act, and that Clitophon is speaking retrospectively of a situation in which he was fooled, but now knows how he was. Clitophon’s original description gave no indication that the sacrifice was an act. Here, the reader begins to be invited into the ‘behind-the-scenes’ action of the performance.

Leucippe chides Menelaus to ‘tell him how you fooled the robbers.’ (λέγε δὲ πῶς τοὺς λῃστὰς ἠπάτησας, 3.18.5). The term ἀπατάω is a loaded one, with particular resonances regarding performance, as has been discussed in chapter three. It signals the theatricality of the performance from the perspective of an ‘actor’ in the show. Leucippe essentially qualifies the act as a theatrical performance by using the most appropriate term to describe the effect upon the audience: the bandits and Clitophon are fully deceived, caught in the illusion. At this point, the trick is revealed in elaborate detail, providing the reader with all of the ‘behind-the-scenes’ action that leads up to the performance of the sacrifice. The robbers had recognised Menelaus as a local Egyptian and welcomed him to their cause. Menelaus, with his ability for acting, seems to have had no trouble convincing the robbers that Satyrus is his servant. References to the mechanics of performance abound, as Satyrus recounts that they were trying to figure out a way to save Leucippe when the robber band set upon a ship, explaining:

> καὶ γάρ τις ἐν αὐτοῖς ἦν τῶν τὰ Ὁμήρου τῷ στόματι δεικνύντων ἐν τοῖς θεάτροις· τὴν Ὁμηρικὴν οὖν σκευὴν ὁπλισάμενος τε αὐτὸς καὶ τοὺς ἀμφ᾽ αὑτὸν οὕτω σκευάσας ἐπεχείρουν μάχεσθαι
>
> now there was among the passengers one of those actors who recite Homer in the theatres: he armed himself with his Homeric gear and also costumed his companions thus, and attempted to do battle (3.20.4-5)

The Homerist's efforts are in vain but fascinating in their own right. Achilles Tatius presents a trained actor who when in mortal peril puts on his Homeric fighting costume and also provides his fellow passengers with such costumes, then attempts to fight accordingly. The idea of an actor who fights onstage then uses his skills in real life is reminiscent of Plato's *Ion*, where the rhapsode claims his recitation of Homer gives him the skills of general.[569] Plato's Socrates pokes fun at Ion's claims, and the fate of the Homerist in Achilles Tatius would appear to justify his skepticism. The brief appearance of the doomed Homerist reveals one way in which a character attempts to use skills from the stage to influence and/or save his own life. In this case, the tactic fails, but it does presage Menelaus and Satyrus' own successful theatrical attempt at self-preservation. The professional performer fails to translate his stage skills into real-life military prowess, but when the novel's characters appropriate theatrical props and use them to imitate real-life, they do a fine job.

Menelaus rescues a trunk that belonged to the Homerist and opens it. Satyrus explains,

> ὁρῶμεν χλαμύδα καὶ ξίφος, τὴν μὲν κώπην ἔχον παλαιστῶν τεσσάρων, τὸν δὲ σίδηρον ἐπὶ κώπῃ βραχύτατον, δακτύλων ὅσον οὐ πλείω τριῶν. ὡς δὲ ἀνελόμενος τὸ ξίφος ὁ Μενέλαος ἔλαθε μεταστρέψας κάτω τὸ τοῦ σιδήρου μέρος, τὸ μικρὸν ἐκεῖνο ξίφος ὥσπερ ἀπὸ χηραμοῦ τῆς κώπης κατατρέχει τοσοῦτον, ὅσον εἶχεν ἡ κώπη τὸ μέγεθος· ὡς δὲ ἀνέστρεψεν εἰς τοὔμπαλιν, αὖθις ὁ σίδηρος εἴσω κατεδύετο. τούτῳ δ᾽ ἄρα, ὡς εἰκός, ὁ κακοδαίμων ἐκεῖνος ἐν τοῖς θεάτροις ἐχρῆτο πρὸς τὰς κιβδήλους σφαγάς.
>
> we saw a cloak and a dagger, which had a very long handle—four palm-widths—but the blade on the hilt was very short, not more than three finger-widths. Menelaus took up the dagger and carelessly tilted down the blade part, when the little blade ran down out of the hole in the handle the distance of the length of the handle; and when turned back again, straightaway the blade sank back in. This, as it

[569] Plato, *Ion* 540d ff.

> seems, had been used in the theatre by that unfortunate man for feigned murders. (3.20.6-7)

The pervasiveness of performance culture continues with the introduction of more theatrical equipment. The description of the trick knife is particularly exciting, as is Satyrus' supposition that the actor must have used it onstage for 'feigned murders'. In Petronius, Homerists perform at Trimalchio's dinner party, enacting the madness of Ajax (who in this case vents his anger by slicing a boiled calf).[570]

The trick knife gives Satyrus an idea that is based on understanding the mechanics of a realistic (and bloody) performance. Satyrus explains to Clitophon that he told Menelaus:

> δέρμα προβάτου λαβόντες ὡς ὅτι ῥαδινώτατον συρράψωμεν εἰς σχῆμα βαλαντίου, μέτρον ὅσον γαστρὸς ἀνθρωπίνης, εἶτα ἐμπλήσαντες θηρείων σπλάγχνων καὶ αἵματος, τὴν πλαστὴν ταύτην γαστέρα ῥάψωμεν, ὡς μὴ ῥᾷον τὰ σπλάγχνα διαπίπτοι καὶ ἐνσκευάσαντες τὴν κόρην τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον καὶ στολὴν ἔξωθεν περιβαλόντες μίτραις τε καὶ ζώμασιν ἐνδεδεμένην τὴν σκευὴν ταύτην ἐπικρύψωμεν... ὁρᾷς δὲ τοῦτὶ τὸ ξίφος ὡς ἔχει μηχανῆς· ἂν γὰρ ἐρείσῃ τις ἐπὶ τινος σώματος, φεύγει πρὸς τὴν κώπην ὥσπερ εἰς κουλεόν· καὶ οἱ μὲν ὁρῶντες δοκοῦσι βαπτίζεσθαι τὸν σίδηρον κατὰ τοῦ σώματος, ὁ δὲ εἰς τὸν χηραμὸν τῆς κώπης ἀνέθορεν, μόνην δὲ καταλείπει τὴν αἰχμήν, ὅσον τὴν πλαστὴν γαστέρα τεμεῖν καὶ τὴν κώπην ἐν χρῷ σφαζομένου τυχεῖν· κἂν ἀποσπάσῃ τις τὸν σίδηρον ἐκ τοῦ τραύματος, καταρρεῖ πάλιν ἐκ τοῦ χηραμοῦ τὸ ξίφος ὅσον τῆς κώπης ἀνακουφίζεται τὸ μετέωρον καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον τοὺς ὁρῶντας ἀπατᾷ· δοκεῖ γὰρ τοσοῦτον ἀναβαίνειν ἐκ τῆς σφαγῆς, ὅσον κάτεισιν ἐκ τῆς μηχανῆς. τούτων οὖν γενομένων, οὐκ ἂν ἴδοιεν[571] οἱ λῃσταὶ τὴν τέχνην.

> We take a sheep's skin, as thin as possible, and sew it into the shape of a pouch, about the size of a man's belly; then we fill it with animal entrails and blood, sew up this fake stomach so that the innards don't leak out easily, and fit it on to the girl this way— putting a dress on the outside and fastening it with bands and girdles so we can hide the contrivance… You see the mechanism of this dagger; for if someone

[570] Petronius, *Satyrica* 59.1-3; Schmeling (2011: 246), Panayotakis (1995: 88-89), Jones (1991), Starr (1987: 199-200). Artemidorus 4.2 (p. 245 Pack) mentions the Homerists' use of fake blood.
[571] Garnaud (1991) prints ἴδοιεν, which I prefer to εἰδεῖεν in Vilborg (1955) and Gaselee (1969), because it emphasises that the knife deceives the eyes.

> presses it against a body, the blade retreats into the handle, as into a sheath; while those are looking on think that the blade is plunged into the body, it has really sprung back into the hollow of the handle, leaving only the point, which is enough to cut the fake stomach, and the handle will just touch the skin of the victim: when someone withdraws it from the wound, the blade leaps back from its cavity as much as the hilt is lifted and it deceives the spectators, for they think that as much of it penetrated at the stroke as now comes out from the mechanism. This being so, the bandits won't see the trick... (3.21.2-5)

Satyrus (and by extension Achilles Tatius) appears to be very well-versed in stage performance. He uses the verb ἐνσκευάζω and noun σκευή, prime theatrical terms regarding costume, echoing their use in the portion about the Homerist, which further underlines the theatricality of Satyrus' plan (3.20.4-5). He explains step by step how to create a false stomach, hide it, and slice it open in just the right way. Achilles Tatius goes to great lengths to explain the trick blade and its use, repeatedly reminding the reader that the blade can retract and extend in a manner that will look convincing but in truth cause no harm to the person it 'impales'. Stylistically, it is possible to say he labours the point, perhaps to prove that Satyrus and Menelaus' sham sacrifice scene could realistically occur. The description of the means to create stage blood, gore and violence is believable. Certainly violence—real or imitated—was not alien to the ancient stage, as discussed above. Suetonius writes of a stage covered in fake blood after a performance of *Laureolus*.[572] It may also be pertinent to note the bloodiness of Senecan tragedies.[573]

Menelaus agrees to Satyrus' plan and soon it is arranged that the pair will sacrifice the maiden. He manages to make sure that they alone will be the ones to prepare Leucippe (3.22.5). They apprise Leucippe of the plan, put her into a

[572] Suetonius, *Gaius/Calig.* 56.
[573] See Zimmerman and Zanobi in Hall and Wyles (2008).

costume and tell her how to 'act' (3.22.6). She must play dead, like the husband in the *Moicheutria* and the mime dog.[574] Mignogna refers to her as '*un'attrice consumata*' along the lines of the mime actress Bassilla, who was memorialised in an inscription for dying onstage many times (πολλάκις ἐν θυμέλαις... θανοῦσα).[575] Satyrus' plan, then, consists of three actors, one costume and two very specific pieces of stage equipment—the knife and the belly. It is one of the most overtly theatrical scenes in any of the extant novels, certainly the most overtly theatrical scene in Achilles Tatius. The way that Clitophon witnesses a scene that is only truly explained later is not completely unique, but Satyrus' plan is the only one to rely on specialised theatrical props. Anderson calls the *Scheintod* 'an obvious opportunity for burlesque [of the novel genre]',[576] based on the congruence of so many convenient circumstances and the elaborate explanation of the ruse, but burlesque of the novel genre does not explain the theatricality of the episode.

Mignogna, in an article titled '*Leucippe in Tauride*', suggests that the episode of Leucippe's *Scheintod* and consequent rescue from the Egyptian bandits is framed by '*un canovaccio di memoria nobilmente euripidea*'.[577] As her title implies, the Euripidean framework she offers is *Iphigenia in Tauris*.[578] Leucippe, like Iphigenia, is trapped among a foreign people with the tendency towards human sacrifice. According to Mignogna, Menelaus and Satyrus take on the roles of Orestes and Pylades.[579] She also mentions the *Charition* mime, which she describes as resembling *Iphigenia in Tauris* (*IT*) and '*contaminato con*

[574] Plutarch, *de soll. An.* 19.
[575] IG XIV 2342; cf. Corbato (1947), Mignogna (1997: 225-226). Wiemken (1972: 167) discusses death in mime.
[576] Anderson (1982: 27).
[577] Mignogna (1997: 228).
[578] See Laplace (2007: 407, 591-597), who also recognises parallels with *IA and IT*.
[579] Mignogna (1997: 228).

alcuni motivi tratti dal Ciclope'.[580] The mime text from P.Oxy 413 certainly seems to recall *IT*, as it contains a brother and sister pair trapped by barbarians (who seem to be Indian).[581] The pair, with the assistance of a buffoonish third protagonist, escape after plying the barbarians with wine— which seems to recall the Cyclops story from the *Odyssey* or, as Mignogna implies, the sole extant satyr play Euripides' *Cyclops.* Edith Hall notes the popularity of the 'escape-from-barbarians' motif in satyr drama and later in Euripidean tragedy, as well as the motif's parody in Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazousae*.[582]

It is important to keep in mind that, although *IT* and *Cyclops* could seem to be so-called 'high-culture' 'literary' analogues, at the time of the novel a reader could be familiar with the plots of both plays without having read or experienced the Euripidean text. *IT* seems to have been a popular play, with evidence from Italian vases suggesting that it was performed consistently in ancient theatre.[583] Images relating to *IT* also are found in Roman wall paintings and mosaics. [584] Euripides could be the source material for pantomime performances or mythological burlesques, as the *Charition* mime seems to imply. As Mignogna concludes:

> *Mimo esotico, pantomima 'mitologica', naumachia omerizante,* performance *prestidigitatoria: la storia della tragica morte e felice risurrezione di Leucippe, al di là della sua illusoria cornice euripidea (un ulteriore effetto* trompe-l'oeil?*), si configura in realtà come un percorso tra i <<bassifondi>> della teatralità…*

[580] Mignogna (1997: 235), Morales (2004: 71).
[581] None of the novelists attempt, as the *Charition* does, to 'transliterate' foreign speech, but Chariton, Achilles Tatius and especially Heliodorus all make their readers aware of the variety of languages spoken by characters in their works, see Saïd (1992). See Salomon (1993) and Hall (2010) for a discussion of Indian language in *Charition*.
[582] Hall (2010: 398).
[583] Taplin (2007: 149-156), Hall (2013a: 69-91).
[584] For example, in Pompeii, paintings from the House of the Citharist, the House of Pinarius Cerealis Casa del Centenario and the House of Caecilius Iucundus. Jucker (1988: fig. 19), Hall (2013a: 94-99, figs. 1-5).

> Exotic mime, 'mythological' pantomime, Homeric *naumachia*, illusionary performance: the story of the tragic death and happy resurrection of Leucippe, beyond its illusory Euripidean frame (another trompe-l'oeil effect?), actually configures a path through the 'slums' of theatricality…[585]

I agree with Mignogna that the confluence of possible mimic and pantomimic references deeply grounds this episode of the novel in the themes and content of contemporary performance culture, although the similarities to Classical tragedy are the ones most easily recognisable today. The allusions to performance culture go beyond parallels in plot, such as Leucippe, Menelaus and Satyrus finding themselves in similar situations to Iphigenia, Orestes and Pylades. Performance culture also informs the actions that the characters take within the text. Satyrus recognises the properties and the trick knife and he and Menelaus are able to plan and stage a performance accordingly, using the stage property they found but also another that they fashion—the false stomach. In other words, the influence of contemporary performance is not static—it goes beyond the construction of a tableau and into the activities of the characters. After Menelaus and Satyrus successfully 'sacrifice' Leucippe, Menelaus seems unable to resist continuing the performance, however briefly. Clitophon serves as the audience for both performances, and he is as taken in by the one as he is by the other. His role as internal observer makes it easy for the reader to experience the spectacles vicariously.

Leucippe's Second *Scheintod*

The omen implied in Clinias' reading of the Philomela painting presages the next ill event to befall Leucippe. Chaereas, the supposedly friendly Egyptian,

[585] Mignogna (1997: 236).

is in fact in love with Leucippe and plots to kidnap her. He hires a pirate band, 'instructing them how to act' (5.3.2). This is why he wishes Leucippe and Clitophon to come to Pharos and celebrate his birthday. When the couple arrives, brigands rush in and take Leucippe. They put her on a ship and Chaereas gives chase with another:

> Ὡς δὲ εἶδον οἱ λῃσταὶ προσιοῦσαν ἤδη τὴν ναῦν εἰς ναυμαχίαν, ἱστᾶσιν ἐπὶ τοῦ καταστρώματος ὀπίσω τὼ χεῖρε δεδεμένην τὴν κόρην· καί τις αὐτῶν μεγάλῃ τῇ φωνῇ, «Ἰδοὺ τὸ ἆθλον ὑμῶν,» εἰπών, ἀποτέμνει αὐτῆς τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν σῶμα ὠθεῖ κατὰ τῆς θαλάσσης. ἐγὼ δὲ ὡς εἶδον, ἀνέκραγον καὶ ὥρμησα ἐμαυτὸν ἐπαφεῖναι
>
> As the pirates saw our ship putting out to give them battle, they brought the maiden up on deck with her hands tied behind her; and one of them cried out with a loud voice, 'Look at your prize,' and cut off her head and threw the rest of her body down into the sea. When I saw this, I cried out and lunged to throw myself overboard (5.7.4-5)

Chaereas uses the pretence of his birthday party to trap Leucippe and Clitophon, and then is party to a greater spectacle. The pirate's words give proof that the spectacle of Leucippe's death is for the pursuers' consumption—his speech is directed at the pursuers; therefore the death is not a random act of violence as much as it is a display. Clitophon is the ideal audience, responding viscerally and emotionally to what he has seen.

Clitophon's ship gives up the chase to recover Leucippe's body, over which Clitophon laments:

> Νῦν μοι Λευκίππη τέθνηκας ἀληθῶς θάνατον διπλοῦν, γῇ καὶ θαλάσσῃ διαιρούμενον. τὸ μὲν γὰρ λείψανον ἔχω σου τοῦ σώματος· ἀπολώλεκα δὲ σέ. οὐκ ἴση τῆς θαλάσσης πρὸς τὴν γῆν ἡ νομή. μικρόν μοί σου μέρος καταλέλειπται ἐν ὄψει τοῦ μείζονος· αὕτη δὲ ἐν ὀλίγῳ τὸ πᾶν σου κρατεῖ. ἀλλ᾽ ἐπεί μοι τῶν ἐν τῷ προσώπῳ φιλημάτων ἐφθόνησεν ἡ Τύχη, φέρε σου καταφιλήσω τὴν σφαγήν.
>
> Now, Leucippe-mine, you have truly died a double death, divided on land and sea. I have the remains of your body, but I have lost you; the division between land and sea is not fair; though it hardly seems that the greater part of you has been left to me, it is really the less, while

> that which seems to possess but a small part of you has the entirety. Come, since Tyche has begrudged me kisses on your face, I will kiss instead your wound. (5.7.8-9)

Clitophon in retrospect refers to the action of making his speech as 'making a threnody' (καταθρηνήσας, 5.8.1), which has resonances with tragedy. Gaselee claims 'no translation can make this laboured rhetoric anything but ridiculous'.[586] Anderson places the second *Scheintod* in the realm of burlesque.[587] Scott McGill argues that Clitophon's speech is not 'puerile or laughable in its horror' as much as it is a literary allusion, combining various themes of epigram in an original way.[588] It is possible to combine these various readings of the speech. Tim Whitmarsh claims Clitophon's response comes from a 'tragic worldview' that 'will be read ironically'.[589] Achilles Tatius has characterised Clitophon as a young man who is fond of making speeches, particularly ones that allow him to show off his erudition and rhetorical skill. Clitophon self-consciously tells the reader that he was lamenting and offers his lament as part of the entertainment provided by his story. The speech resonates with oratory, particularly in Clitophon's argument that the division between land and sea is not a fair one. As McGill notes, Achilles Tatius would not be the first novel author to borrow themes from another literary genre,[590] nor would he be the first rhetorician to do the same. It could be argued that Clitophon's combination of paradox and epigram themes, in a speech of lamentation, *is* clumsy and therefore laughable, offering the reader a certain form of burlesque. Gaselee, Anderson, and McGill

[586] Gaselee (1969: 253 n 1).
[587] Anderson (1982: 27-28), 'Although the second and third [*Scheintode*] are something of an anticlimax after the ingenuity of the first, they afford Clitophon the unique lament that his beloved's body is subject to the law of diminishing returns: first he was left with the whole corpse, next with the body and no head, third time round with nothing at all.'
[588] McGill (2000: 323-326).
[589] Whitmarsh (2011: 208-209).
[590] McGill (2000: 326).

each assume that the speech must be either 'low-culture' and humorous, or 'high-culture' and in earnest. There need not be such barriers. It is unfair to allow erudition to trump humour, especially when erudition may be the source of the humour. In addition, the 'grotesque' inclusion of Clitophon's intention to kiss Leucippe's wounded neck is in its way no more horrific than when the bandits appeared to consume her entrails and could fall into the same category of sensational spectacle.

Of course, Leucippe is not truly dead. Although Clitophon has the evidence of a body, he does not have the most easily identifiable portion—the head. Although Leucippe is reintroduced, alive, into the story at the end of book five, the reader is not given an explanation of how she survived decapitation until close to the conclusion of the novel in book eight. Clitophon asks,

> Οὐκ ἐρεῖς ἡμῖν τὸν μῦθον τῶν τῆς Φάρου λῃστῶν καὶ τῆς ἀποτμηθείσης ἐκεῖ τὸ αἴνιγμα κεφαλῆς, ἵνα σου καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἀκούσῃ; τοῦτο γὰρ μόνον ἐνδέει πρὸς ἀκρόασιν τοῦ παντὸς δράματος.
>
> Will you not tell us the story about the bandits of Pharos, and the mystery of the decapitation there, so that your father can hear it? That is the only part of the whole plot that remains to be heard. (8.15.4)

Clitophon claims that it is her father who has not heard the tale, but it is also the reader. The mention that this portion has been left unexplained seems a tad self-conscious on the part of the author, as does the inclusion of the terms μῦθος and δρᾶμα. Clitophon's exhortation reminds the reader of the unsolved mystery and categorises it as a fictional story or a performance.

Leucippe explains that her apparent decapitation was the final trick out of a series of misrepresentations:

> «Γυναῖκα,» ἔφη, «κακοδαίμονα ἐξαπατήσαντες οἱ λῃσταὶ τῶν ἐπὶ μισθῷ πωλουσῶν τὰ Ἀφροδίτης, ὡς δὴ ναυκλήρῳ τινὶ γυναῖκα συνεσομένην ἐπὶ τοῦ σκάφους, ταύτην εἶχον ἐπὶ τῆς νεώς, ἀγνοοῦσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐφ' ᾧ παρῆν, ὑποπίνουσαν δὲ ἡσυχῇ σύν

τινι τῶν πειρατῶν· λόγῳ δ ἦν ἐραστὴς ὁ λῃστής. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἁρπάσαντές με, ὡς εἶδες, ἐνέθεσαν τῷ σκάφει... ὁρῶντες τὴν διώκουσαν ναῦν, περιελόντες τόν τε κόσμον καὶ τὴν ἐσθῆτα τῆς ταλαιπώρου γυναικὸς ἐμοὶ περιτιθέασι, τοὺς δὲ ἐμοὺς χιτωνίσκους ἐκείνῃ· καὶ στήσαντες αὐτὴν ἐπὶ τῆς πρύμνης ὅθεν διώκοντες ὄψεσθε, τὴν δὲ κεφαλὴν ἀποτέμνουσιν αὐτῆς, καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἔρριψαν, ὡς εἶδες, κατὰ τῆς θαλάσσης, τὴν δὲ κεφαλήν, ὡς ἔπεσεν, εἶχον ἐπὶ τῆς νεώς τότε... οὐκ οἶδα δὲ πότερον τούτου χάριν προπαρασκευάσαντες ἔτυχον τὴν γυναῖκα... τῷ δὲ διώκεσθαι πρὸς ἀπάτην τῶν διωκόντων ἀντ᾽ ἐμοῦ σφάττουσι»

'The bandits', she replied, 'fooled an unfortunate woman, one of those who sell Aphrodite's wares for money, into thinking that a certain ship owner on board would make her his wife. They kept this woman on the ship, ignorant of the true reason of her presence, drinking in silence with one of the pirates, who claimed to be in love with her. When they carried me off, as you know, they put me on the deck... When they saw the ship coming in pursuit, they took the jewellery and clothing from the poor woman and put them on me, and put my dress on her. Then standing her up on the stern, where she would be visible to you pursuers, they cut off her head, and threw her body into the sea, as you saw, and kept the head, when it fell, on board the ship at that time... I do not know whether they had pre-arranged for the woman's presence... because of the pursuit they slaughtered her in my place to deceive the pursuers,' (8.16.1-3)

Once again, Leucippe has been put into a costume— this time to appear as someone else. In addition, an unlucky woman is costumed as 'Leucippe'. Acting and deception (ἐξαπατήσαντες) are used to bring the woman to the ship and keep her aboard. Her death is deliberately staged as 'the death of Leucippe': her headless body clothed in Leucippe's dress becomes a convincing stage prop, while her head, which would spoil the illusion, is kept out of sight of the 'audience'. The missing head plays the same role as a stage actor's mask, concealing his identity and allowing him to play multiple roles. Sight lines also play a part; the woman is brought to the stern of the ship so that Clitophon and the other pursuers/spectators can easily watch the performance. Leucippe again refers to theatrical deception—this time the bandits plan their staging of her death in order to fool (πρὸς ἀπάτην) an audience.

The disturbing (but soon shown to be false) violence of the first *Scheintod* is replaced with genuine violence in the second. I am reminded of the various permutations of the mime *Laureolus*, where stage violence could be replaced with a genuine execution.[591] Another difference between the first *Scheintod* and the second is the distance between the death scene and its explanation. While the sacrifice and resurrection of Leucippe occur within a few chapters, three entire books separate Leucippe's beheading and its explanation. Although Leucippe re-enters the story a few chapters after her second *Scheintod*, the mystery of how she has survived hangs over the novel until the final book. Perhaps the prolongation is meant to add suspense, or perhaps the reader is being invited to think of some way in which her death could have been staged. The sacrifice scene is explained in expansive theatrical detail, and it is possibly that the reader would anticipate a similar explanation. The theatricalisation of decapitation would not have been an impossible task—Agave wields the head of Pentheus in Euripides' *Bacchae*, a scene so famous it was later performed separate from the play itself.[592]

The circumstances of Leucippe's final *Scheintod* do not involve Leucippe herself at all. It is strange that after two gruesome *Scheintode* Leucippe's last 'death' in the novel should be told by a messenger. Is it because Thersander, for all his grand plans, lacks a trick knife? Has Achilles Tatius run out of gory ideas? The messenger is a well-known tradition of Greek tragedy, as is the false messenger (such as Orestes in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* and Menelaus in Euripides' *Helen*). Perhaps Achilles Tatius wishes to run the gamut of sub-literary *and* literary performance deaths. Previously, Leucippe had 'died'

[591] Juvenal, *Sat.* 8.188; Josephus, *AJ* 19.94; Martial, *Lib. Spect.* 7. For further on *Laureolus* see chapters one and eight.
[592] Plutarch, *Life of Crassus* 33.

violently—through false and genuine murders. In her final death of the novel, she dies via rumour.

Leucippe's rumoured death runs chronologically concurrent with her imprisonment. Clitophon is also incarcerated, awaiting trial for adultery. Thersander wishes to see him put out of the way by means of poison (7.1.2), but the gaoler refuses to cooperate. Instead, the gaoler agrees to let Thersander send in a cellmate. Clitophon explains,

> ἔμελλε δ' ἐκεῖνος ὑπὸ τοῦ Θερσάνδρου δεδιδαγμένος τεχνικῶς πάνυ περὶ τῆς Λευκίππης λόγον ἐμβαλεῖν, ὡς εἴη πεφονευμένη, τῆς Μελίτης συσκευασαμένης τὸν φόνον.
>
> he intended to tell me a most cleverly composed story about Leucippe, instructed by Thersander, that she had been killed, with Melite having orchestrated the murder (7.1.4).

Like a playwright or stage manager, Thersander prepares his actor and gives him a story to relate. The theatrical scenario is underscored by the actions of the false prisoner, who 'began the drama' (τοῦ δράματος ἤρχετο, 7.2.1). The man groans and mutters until another prisoner asks for his story. Instead of describing any crime, he tells of his capture and of his companion's confessing to the murder (7.3.1-6). Clitophon asks for details, 'In what way did the hired murderer kill the girl, and what did he do with her body?' (Τίνα τρόπον τὴν κόρην ἀπέκτεινεν… ὁ μισθωτός, καὶ τί πεποίηκε τὸ σῶμα; 7.4.2). The prisoner replies, 'I only heard from the killer that he had killed the girl: he did not tell me where or how' (ταῦτα ἤκουσα μόνα τοῦ πεφονευκότος, ὡς κτείνας εἴη τὴν κόρην· ποῦ δὲ καὶ τίνα τρόπον, οὐκ εἶπεν, 7.4.3). Thersander's plan is shown to have shortcomings—his actor cannot improvise and has no salacious details to share. Clitophon is denied a vicarious visual experience of this final violence to Leucippe.

Although it is perhaps natural for a lover to ask after the manner of his beloved's death and the location of her body, Clitophon's questions also serve as a fascinating conclusion to the protagonist's visual consumption of violence towards Leucippe. He has watched Leucippe 'die' twice, experiencing horror and fascination.[593] It is therefore slightly macabre that he asks how the murder was committed as well as what happened to Leucippe's body. This time he has not been a witness, and when he asks for such voyeuristic details he is emphatically denied them. His questions echo the fascination found in his witnessing of the earlier *Scheintode,* when he is unable to look away. Only after Clitophon is denied such voyeuristic details does he begin to weep (7.3.4).

Later in the novel, Leucippe finds herself captive and endangered once again. She gives a fierce speech when her captor Thersander threatens to torture her into deference and obedience:

> ἰδοὺ χεῖρες, τεινέτω. φερέτω καὶ μάστιγας· ἰδοὺ νῶτος, τυπτέτω. κομιζέτω πῦρ· ἰδοὺ σῶμα, καιέτω. φερέτω καὶ σίδηρον· ἰδοὺ δέρη, σφαζέτω. ἀγῶνα θεάσασθε καινὸν· πρὸς πάσας τὰς βασάνους ἀγωνίζεται μία γυνὴ καὶ πάντα νικᾷ.
>
> Behold my arms, let him stretch them out. Let him bring whips: behold my back, let him strike it. Let him bring fire; behold my body, let him burn it. Let him bring a sword also; behold my neck, let him pierce it. Gaze at this a new agon; one woman contends against all tortures and overcomes all. (6.21.1-2)

Leucippe seems to feel that she is on a stage. She repeatedly invites Thersander (and by extension the reader) to 'look' at her body.[594] She offers a 'new sight'—a woman triumphant in the face of peril. In terms of the novel genre, this would not be a necessarily new circumstance—the female protagonists of earlier novels, Callirhoe and Anthia, both overcome unwanted attentions and abduction by

[593] Elsom (1992: 216-218), Montague (1992: 244-246), Haynes (2003: 58).
[594] Morales (2004: 205).

bandits. Leucippe's invitation to watch her suffer resonates particularly well with the spectacles Achilles Tatius contrives for his readers. Twice already the reader, in the company of Clitophon, has been the audience to (apparent) violence towards Leucippe's body. It seems, at last, that Leucippe becomes an active participant in the spectacle of her own suffering.[595]

The trials Leucippe lists are not typical misadventures for the women of other novels; instead they resemble the punishments suffered by martyrs, particularly Christian martyrs. Like a martyr, she holds beliefs that her captors do not share. She says she is a virgin, a claim to which Thersander responds with cynicism, quipping about the sexual continence of pirates (6.21.3). Her response to Thersander's disbelief is far from comic. She gives an extended speech in defense of her sexual purity:

> Ἡ παρθένος… καί τις ἐρεῖ, κἂν νῦν μαινόμενος φονεύσῃς· 'Λευκίππη παρθένος μετὰ βουκόλους, παρθένος καὶ μετὰ Χαιρέαν, παρθένος καὶ μετὰ Σωσθένην.' … λάμβανε κατ᾽ ἐμοῦ τὰς μάστιγας, τὸν τροχὸν, τὸ πῦρ, τὸν σίδηρον… ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ γυμνή καὶ μόνη καὶ γυνή, καὶ ἕν ὅπλον ἔχω τὴν ἐλευθερίαν, ἣ μήτε πληγαῖς κατακόπτεται μήτε σιδήρῳ κατατέμνεται μήτε πυρὶ κατακαίεται. οὐκ ἀφήσω ποτὲ ταύτην ἐγώ· κἂν καταφλέγῃς, οὐχ οὕτως θερμὸν εὑρήσεις τὸ πῦρ.
>
> Yes, a virgin, … if you kill me now in your madness, someone will even say, 'Here is Leucippe, who was a virgin among bandits, who remained a virgin after Chaereas, who even remained a virgin after Sosthenes!' … bring out against me the whips, the wheel, the fire, the sword… I am defenceless and alone and a woman; but I have one shield, my freedom [of soul], which cannot be cut down by blows, or cut up with a sword, or the burnt by a fire. I will never surrender that; you may burn, but you will find that there is no fire hot enough! (6.22.1-4.)

Leucippe's virginity is her greatest concern; the list of her misadventures is consistently punctuated with the preservation of her chastity through each one. Her position as beleaguered but inviolate is alien to New and Roman comedy,

[595] It could be argued that Leucippe is an 'active' participant in her first *Scheintod*, as she has been prepared for it, but the only 'action' that is required of her is inaction—to play dead.

where girls raped at festivals conceal their consequent pregnancies, as well as alien to mime, where sexual (mis)conduct was an important plot device.[596] Leucippe's 'obsessive exaltation of virginity' places her in the realm of martyrs.[597] Leucippe shares characteristics with female Christian martyrs in her miraculously preserved virginity and in her willingness to be tortured or killed instead of act against her beliefs.[598]

Martyrdom is a spectacle in itself, one that Leucippe welcomes.[599] She tells Thersander that his actions will bring her greater public praise, (ἐγκώμιόν... πλεῖον, 6.22.2; τὸ δὲ μεῖζον ἐγκώμιον, 6.22.3). Morales observes that 'in one sense, of course, Leucippe's fantasy is an ironic, self-referential comment on the book itself, which can be read as an encomium to Leucippe.'[600] More than just an encomium to Leucippe, the book can be read as a compendium of violations done to Leucippe (or 'Leucippe') rendered in as great or greater detail than anything she does.[601] Leucippe, perhaps, becomes more interesting to Clitophon when she is victimised than when she is out of danger. Her impassioned speeches invite the reader to be like Clitophon, to recognise his role as voyeur and acknowledge the performance of violence Achilles Tatius lays out for his entertainment.

Conclusion

[596] For example, Valerius Maximus 2.10.8 relates the famous anecdote of Cato leaving the celebration of the Floralia when the mime actresses hesitated to undress with him in the crowd, ([Catone] *ludos Florales, quos Messius aedilis faciebat, spectante populus ut mimae nudarentur postulare erubuit, … discessit e theatro, ne praesentia sua spectaculi consuetudinem impediret)*. See also Seneca, *Ep*. 97.7 and Martial, *Praef*. 1. Bonaria (1955-1956: vol. 2, 28).
[597] Morales (2004: 203), Chew (2003). See also Andújar (2012), who focuses on Chariclea.
[598] Morales (2004: 205). Chew (2003: 138) claims 'Leucippe prefigures the martyrs' in her call for torture.
[599] Potter (1993).
[600] Morales (2004: 205).
[601] Elsom (1992: 216-218), Montague (1992: 244-246), Haynes (2003: 58).

Leucippe consents to be an actress in her first death (which only requires playing dead), her dress is a prop in the second, and she has no part at all in the third—her agency decreases each time, while Clitophon's role as an audience is increased. Even her explanation of the second death occurs at the urging of Clitophon, who wants her to tell the story to her father (and the reader). When she is captured by Thersander, Leucippe, for the first time, invites violence and spectators.

Clitophon's role as an audience to the *Scheintode* increases throughout the novel. First he is one in a crowd, second he is the head of a rescue party, and third he is the sole target of the performance. Clitophon cannot look away from either of Leucippe's death scenes, and he is just as engrossed by the telling of her third 'death'. Clitophon is convinced by all three, but at the time he recounts his entire story, he knows that each is false. Nevertheless, he chooses to relate his original viewing experience to the reader without any reassurances or caveats that Leucippe will be well. He presents Leucippe's third death differently, explaining from the beginning that his fellow prisoner is an actor. By the third death, it is possible that a reader would not be so gullible as to believe that the third time is the charm. It is here that the reader's perspective is split from Clitophon's—he recounts reactions they cannot experience, since they have been forewarned. This third death allows the reader to see Clitophon as an audience responding to a performance, which could change their interpretation of his first two sets of reactions. Clitophon's consumption of Leucippe's death scenes is voyeuristic,[602] and it is a voyeurism shared with the reader, and possibly even understood by Leucippe.

[602] Haynes (2003: 57).

6. Adultery Mime in Chariton and Achilles Tatius

Introduction

In the previous chapters, I discussed ways in which theatrical performance mechanics appear in the novels, particularly as an interest in the roles of an 'actor' and an 'audience'. At times resonances of ancient drama have appeared but rarely in programmatic ways. In this chapter I focus on a specific performance genre, mime—particularly adultery mime—and how Chariton and Achilles Tatius both interact with it. Chariton appears to use the structure of the mime genre as a touchstone or model for a single short episode in Callirhoe, while Achilles Tatius appears to borrow stock elements from adultery mime while highlighting and flouting the conventions of a variety of genres.

Chariton's engagement with the adultery mime is relatively straightforward, in that the episode in question appears to follow the structure of a mime plot linearly, with few deviations until the episode's shocking conclusion. The author seems to prime his readers for a comic outcome based on mime plots, but instead provides a more sobering denouement. The suitors' plot against Chaereas walks through the preparation for a production, as well as the production itself. In this way, the suitors' plot is in keeping with much that has been discussed earlier regarding the mechanics of a theatrical production. Chariton characterises the villain as a director who puts on a show for the naïve Chaereas, who cannot tell the difference between performance and real life.

Achilles Tatius, on the other hand, does not follow a single linear mime plot. Instead, he draws on stock mime characters and situations to colour his more complicated situation, which includes two (or even three) potential adulterers, a love triangle, and elements from other performance genres. Achilles

Tatius does not rely on any single genre, and the adultery mime is but one of multiple references. His mélange of high and low cultural touchstones resembles both sides of P.Oxy 413, from the menace of the *Moicheutria* to *Charition*'s combination of classical tragedy and slapstick humour.

Adultery and Jealousy Mimes

At this point it would be useful to review the evidence regarding the two mime sub-genres with which Chariton and Achilles Tatius appear to engage. R.W. Reynolds and Patrick Kehoe have conducted the most in-depth examination of the adultery mime, and J. McKeown adds a valuable contribution with his article on mime in Augustan elegy.[603] In Ovid's *Tristia*, the author laments,

> *quid si scripsissem mimos obscena iocantes,*
> *qui semper vetiti crimen amoris habent?*
> *in quibus assidue cultus procedit adulter,*
> *verbaque dat stulto callida nupta viro.*
>
> What if I had written obscene joking mimes.
> which always show the crime of forbidden love?
> in which constantly the well-groomed adulterer enters,
> and the clever wife lies to her stupid husband.[604]

As Kehoe argues, *semper* points to the popularity of the mime, while *assidue* implies a certain uniformity of plot.[605] The standard plot would present a clever young wife, who, along with her cultured lover, would deceive her dim-witted husband. The lovers would be interrupted, with variations in which the lover would hide, presumably from the jealous husband.[606] This tradition, particularly that of an adulterer hiding in a chest from the threatening husband, can be found

[603] Reynolds (1946), Kehoe (1984), McKeown (1984).
[604] Ovid, *Tristia* 2. 497-502.
[605] Kehoe (1984: 90).
[606] Reynolds (1946: 81-85), Petrides (2003), Webb (2008: 105).

in Juvenal and Horace. Both authors mention the scenario and likely expect the reader to recognise the situation from mime. A scholiast on Juvenal even makes a note about the similarity to mime.[607] Comic, slapstick violence plays a role in mime, perhaps upon the discovery of the lover.[608] The *stultus* husband was often played by a character called the μῶρος in Greek, the *stupidus* in Latin. The lover was played by the μοιχός or *moechus,* adulterer. Choricius claims that in the mime the husband would eventually eschew violence and take the adulterous pair to court, which may have been a late variation.[609] Even in this version, however, it seems that the lovers would remain unpunished and the *stupidus* the butt of the joke.

The jealous husband could be called the *zelotypus*, as in Juvenal, who describes the colleague of a *stupidus* named Corinthus as *zelotypus Thymeles*.[610] In addition to the jealous husband, there is also a jealous female character. From centuries earlier, Herodas' fifth mimiamb, which involves a jealous mistress punishing her slave/lover for being unfaithful, has the title ΖΗΛΟΤΥΠΟΣ, which Cunningham emends to Η ΖΗΛΟΤΥΠΟΣ—the Jealous Woman. In the mimiamb, a woman accuses her slave, with whom she has had a sexual

[607] Juvenal 6.41-4, *quid fieri non posse putes, si iungitur ulla/ Ursidio? si moechorum notissimus olim/ Stulta maritali iam porrigit ora capistro,/ quem totiens texit perituri cista Latini?,* 'Is there anything you would not think possible, if some woman were to marry Ursidius? If the most notable of adulterers now stretches his face in a marital bridle, whom Latinus' chest has covered so many times, who was in fear of his life?' To which the scholiast adds *qui totiens superveniente marito sub cista celatus est ut in mimo*, 'who has been hidden in a chest many times, when the husband arrives, as in mime'. Also in Horace, Sat. 2.7.58-61,
quid refert, uri virgis ferroque necari/ auctoratus eas, an turpi clausus in arca,/ quo te dimisit peccati conscia erilis/ contractum genibus tangas caput?, 'what matter whether you are handed over to be burned with birch and killed by sword, or hidden in a shameful chest, where [the maid], conscious of her mistress's sin, sent you, crouching as you touch your head to your knees?'.
[608] Martial 2.72.3-4.
[609] Choricius, *Ap. m.* 30.
[610] Juv. 8.197, *zelotypus Thymeles, stupidi collega Corinthi*, 'the jealous husband of Thymele, colleague of the stupidus Corinthus'.

relationship, of sleeping with someone else.[611] The slave protests, despite some evidence to the contrary; the mime ends inconclusively. A similar situation is found on the verso of P.Oxy 413, often called the *Moicheutria*. Portions of the *Moicheutria* mime include a mistress trying and failing to seduce a slave, whom she sends to be executed along with the woman he apparently prefers.[612] These appear to represent a version of the 'Jealous Mistress' mime, in which a woman vents her anger over the unfaithfulness of her beloved, who, if these two represent a common theme, may usually have been a slave or other subordinate.[613]

The Suitors' Plot

The suitors' plot in the first book is the most overtly theatrical episode in Chariton, from its vocabulary to its action. After Chaereas wins the hand of Callirhoe through public sympathy, his jealous rivals scheme to drive the young newlyweds apart. The suitor from Acragas, leader of the band of rivals, devises a plan. He suggests that they arouse Chaereas' jealousy by staging a party while Chaereas is out of town. In the night, while Callirhoe sleeps, the suitors dress the front of her house with garlands, perfumes, spilled wine and half-burnt torches, to make it appear as if she had thrown a party in her husband's absence (1.2.2). Chaereas, fooled by the staged scenery, confronts Callirhoe, who successfully defends herself against his accusations. They reconcile and the plot is foiled. Next, the suitors hire two people, one to play 'concerned citizen', the other to

[611] For the most recent edition of Herodas see Zanker (2009).
[612] For further consideration of *Moicheutria*, see Andreassi (2000) and (2001).
[613] Juvenal 6.278 also mentions the idea of the jealous wife, or one who is in a sexual relationship with a slave or other social inferior: *si tibi zelotypae retegantur scrinia moechae! sed iacet in servi complexibus aut equitis,* 'if you open the jealous adulteress's writing desk! Or she lies in the arms of a servant or knight'.

play ‘lover’. The concerned citizen warns Chaereas that his wife is unfaithful, and suggests that he lay in wait to watch for her lover. He does so, and sees the actor-as-lover enter his home. Furious, he rushes into his house and encounters not a lover, but Callirhoe herself. In his anger, he kicks her in the womb and appears to kill her.

Although this episode does not require an intertextual dialogic partner to appeal to readers, it is nevertheless richer and funnier when read in light of the mime genre. The plot, which consists of two parts, plays on themes found in attested mime plots and extant mime ‘libretti’. Similar to the way in which Aristophanes’ *Thesmophoriazousai* and *Acharnians* reenact portions of famous Classical tragedies for comic effect, Chariton seems to take well-known mime plots and place them in an incongruous context—a sentimental tale of love, loss and eventual reunion. In contrast to the bathetic nature of Aristophanes’ use of tragedy, Chariton’s use of mime produces both comic and tragic effect—both of which would have been heightened for an audience familiar with at least mime themes if not specific mime performances. Perhaps Chariton is incorporating a genre popular with his contemporary audience.

When the suitors debate over how to get revenge and who should lead them, the suitor from Acragas offers them a plan. He tells his fellows, ‘I will arm Jealousy against him, and she, with Love as her ally, will accomplish some evil’ (ἐφοπλιῶ γὰρ αὐτῷ Ζηλοτυπίαν, ἥτις σύμμαχον λαβοῦσα τὸν Ἔρωτα μέγα τι κακὸν διαπράξεται, 1.2.5). He asserts that Chaereas,

> οἷα δὴ γυμνασίοις ἐντραφεὶς καὶ νεωτερικῶν ἁμαρτημάτων οὐκ ἄπειρος, δύναται ῥᾳδίως ὑποπτεύσας ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς νεωτερικὴν ζηλοτυπίαν,

> raised in the gymnasium and not unacquainted with youthful follies, can easily be made suspicious and lured into youthful jealousy. (1.2.6)

He mentions ζηλοτυπία twice within one short speech, once as an apparent personification, and again as a simple noun. The term's specific connotations refer to sexual jealousy and its relationship with jealous violence, especially in comedy, particularly in mime.[614] ζηλοτυπία is prosaic or comic, and is not used in 'serious' Latin or Greek poetry.[615] Although in the first century CE the word could be used to mean jealousy, in light of the action that follows, I find it difficult to ignore the mimic connotation. Not only does the Acragantine suitor create a farce, he explicitly refers to ζηλοτυπία.

The word ζηλοτυπία brings to mind the character of the jealous woman. Chaereas' stormy emotional reaction to Callirhoe's possible infidelity after seeing the 'party' trappings outside their home—he bursts into tears—may seem rather feminine. Perhaps the scene is a deliberate inversion of a 'Jealousy' mime, adding humour to the first portion of the suitors' plot. Instead of an angry, emotional, woman who has become attached to a slave, Chaereas, a freeborn male, weeps and accuses his freeborn wife of infidelity. She, unlike the male slave, boldly and effectively asserts herself and protects her threatened social position.[616]

Although it is impossible to prove that Chariton was familiar with either Herodas fifth mimiamb or the *Moicheutria* (especially since they are known to us only by the lucky accident of preservation), he could have been familiar with the

[614] Fantham (1980) provides a thorough investigation of the term. Crismani (1997: 30) sees Chaereas' jealousy as similar to New Comedy.
[615] Fantham (1980: 55).
[616] Konstan (1989), Webb (2008: 135). As in Herodas' mime, it is a woman, Bitinna, who asserts herself, establishing her voice in her own household. However, at that point the character similarities between Callirhoe and Bitinna end.

theme. The existence of two papyrological finds, centuries apart in date, yet containing similar 'jealous woman' plots suggests that it may have been part of a performance tradition.[617] If Chariton is in fact playing on the 'Jealous Mistress' theme, then *Callirhoe* provides further evidence for such a tradition. Herodas wrote in the 200s BCE, while the *Moicheutria* has been dated to the 200s CE. *Callirhoe* falls directly in between these two, which, though it is still a separation of centuries, adds to the argument for a continuity of performance tradition.

Even if it is too difficult to prove any play on the 'Jealous Woman' trope, as the word ζηλότυπος is not reserved for women,[618] there is another similarity—and difference—to the adultery mime genre at work in this section.[619] Callirhoe responds to Chaereas' accusations with a clever retort,

> «οὐδεὶς ἐπὶ τὴν πατρῴαν οἰκίαν ἐκώμασεν» εἶπε, «τὰ δὲ σὰ πρόθυρα συνήθη τυχόν ἐστι τοῖς κώμοις, καὶ τὸ γεγαμηκέναι σε λυπεῖ τοὺς ἐραστάς»
>
> 'no one has come reveling to my father's house,' she said. 'Perhaps your vestibule is used to revels, and your marriage has upset your lovers' (1.3.6)

The 'sententiousness' and the 'iambic rhythm' of the speech, leads G.P. Goold to suggest that the line recalls New Comedy. The term ἐραστάς, coming from the mouth of a young wife, along with the sententiousness, could also recall mime, which dealt in both vulgarity and gnomic statements.[620] In addition, the *komos*

[617] Webb (2008: 111) calls Herodas' mime an 'intertext' for the *Moicheutria*, and suggests a performance tradition.
[618] Goold (1995: 41).
[619] In Menander's *Perikeiromene* 986-7, the male protagonist announces, that he is an avenging spirit, and a jealous man, (ὁ δ' ἀλάστωρ ἐγὼ/ καὶ ζηλότυπος ἄνθρωπος …). A woman in Aristophanes' *Plutus* claims her former lover is beating her after another man looked at her, as the youth was exceedingly jealous, οὕτω σφόδρα ζηλότυπος ὁ νεανίσκος ἦν. (1014-16). Cf. Fantham (1980). *Zelotypus* is also used to describe slighted lovers in Martial 1.93.13, Quintilian 4.2.30 and Juvenal 5.44.
[620] Gellius 16.7, *ex sordidiore vulgi*, 'dirtier common speech'.

was a topic of Greek and perhaps Roman mime.[621] The line is surprising and perhaps out of character for a paragon such as Callirhoe, which further highlights its potential humour.

Callirhoe's speech resembles one made by the character Melite in *Leucippe and Clitophon*, when she attempts to convince her husband that she has had no adulterous relationship with Clitophon. In Melite's case it is a *Trugrede*, a false speech in keeping with the adultery mime trope in which the clever wife declares her loyalty to her husband.[622] Callirhoe's *Trugrede*, however, is another potential play on the adultery mime plot—it is a *Treurede*, a true speech. Callirhoe defends her honour worthily, in contrast to the typical mimic adulteress. Her truth resembles the mimic actress's lies, which, if Chaereas is a spectator of mime, may explain how he is so easily deceived in the second portion of the suitors' plot. It is true that the connection (and the joke) would be lost to those unfamiliar with the 'Jealous Woman' or 'Adultery' theme. In this way, it is little different from any sophisticated literary reference, except that, instead of testing the audience's knowledge of a literary or philosophical text, it challenges their knowledge of performance culture, thus appealing to those in possession of a different sort of 'cultural capital', in addition to that acquired by means of participation in élite literary and declamatory culture.

Chariton does not leave his readers without clues to the nature of his allusions. In fact, the entire episode is couched in performance and theatrical terms. After their first failed attempt, the suitors contrive a more elaborate plan that brings the themes of theatre to the fore. They employ actors to play roles in something that, at first, resembles a New Comedy plot or even Plautine

[621] For Greek mime, see P.Lit. Lond. 50, Herondas' second mimiamb and Theocritus' second *Idyll*. For komastic mimes in Rome, see McKeown (1984: 77) and Fantham (1989: 158-159).
[622] Mignogna (1996a: 239).

comedy,[623] which often involves similar coaching and acting, as well as Aristophanic comedy.[624] Furthermore, this kind of 'play within a play', complete with 'internalised' directors and actors is not only a comic device but also a staple of self-reflexive, sophisticated tragedy.[625] Through a single device he manages to place his story within a venerable, historical dramatic tradition.[626]

This dramatic device, with its distinguished literary pedigree, may recall multiple genres, though in this case comedy appears at the forefront. The Acragantine suitor employs a person whom Goold, in the Loeb edition, calls 'a crony', but in the Greek is a παράσιτος. The term 'parasite', in Greek, has two disparate definitions. It originally referred to an officiant at a temple, and later became the term for a Greek comic character type, the hungry hanger-on.[627] In this case, and in Chariton's time, the use of the term would clearly signal the comic denotation. Parasites are a feature of New Comedy and Roman comedy; Chariton's use of the word again emphasises the theatrical nature of the passage. The character of the parasite was not restricted to literate (or rather, 'literary') comedy. One of the characters in the *Moicheutria* is a παράσιτος. This instance, along with the knowledge that mime often satirised daily city life, suggests that the parasite could have been a common character for mime. At the very least, the

[623] Crismani (1997: 30), Mason (2002: 21-22), Brethes (2007a: 29-32), Tilg (2010: 138) refer to New Comedy as an intertext for the episode.
[624] For instance, in Plautus' *Miles Gloriosus*, the slave Palaestrio persuades his former master Pleusicles to play a seaman and for Pleusicles' lover Philocomasium to impersonate her 'sister' Honoria. In Menander's *Aspis*, a character fakes his death and his family feign bereavement. In Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazousae*, the character Euripides portrays himself and his in-law as characters of various tragedies.
[625] Chariton, in his prose narrative, engages with a tradition not only theatrical but 'metatheatrical'. See the role-playing of Neoptolemus and Odysseus in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*, or even the interaction between Athena, Ajax and Odysseus in the prologue of Sophocles' *Ajax.* In Classical tragedy, however, the metatheatricality is subliminal, never betrayed by linguistic tropes. Hall (2006: 108-11).
[626] See Gutzwiller (2000) for further discussion of the tradition of 'metatheatrical allusion' in terms of Menander.
[627] Lofberg (1920), Damon (1995: 181). Damon (1995) examines the parasite in comedy and real life in Greece and Rome.

term does not belong exclusively to New Comedy and Roman comedy and could have evoked a broader range of performance for Chariton's contemporaries.

The suitor from Acragas enlists the παράσιτος to seduce Callirhoe's maid. Chariton's language clearly recalls the stage as the suitor 'told him to play the role of a lover' (τοῦτον ἐκέλευσεν ὑποκριτὴν ἔρωτος γενέσθαι, 1.4.1). The word ὑποκριτής, meaning actor or role, specifically a speaking role, is found in Aristophanes and Plato, among others.[628] The term appears a second time when 'the producer (or director) of the drama recruited another actor' (ὁ δημιουργὸς τοῦ δράματος ὑποκριτὴν ἕτερον ἐξηῦρεν, 1.4.2).[629] This second character is charged with approaching Chaereas and, in the guise of a concerned onlooker, informing him that his wife has taken a lover. In calling the suitor from Acragas ὁ δημιουργὸς τοῦ δράματος and the two cronies ὑποκριτής, Chariton explicitly constructs a drama on the page.[630] The suitor serves as producer and director of a dramatic production as he sets a stage, employs and coaches actors, and ensnares his own audience—Chaereas—so successfully that he joins the performance and brings it to a tragic conclusion.

The plot of the production crafted by the Acragantine suitor has more in common with mime than with other forms of comedy, although the initial preparation does recall literary comedy. The Acragantine 'coached (the second actor) on what he should do and say' (τοῦτον προδιδάξας ἃ χρὴ πράττειν καὶ λέγειν, 1.4.3). Not only does the suitor from Acragas recruit actors, he gives them words and actions to perform. The episode is similar to those in

[628] Aristophanes, *Wasps* 1279; Plato, *Republic* 373b. Csapo and Slater (1995: 221).
[629] Porter (2003: 439) is the only scholar, to my knowledge, who begins to link the theatricality of the suitor's plot with the adultery mime theme. He does so, rightly, to argue contra Kapparis (2000) that Lysias 1 is not the most likely reference for the suitor's plot, and that there are numerous stock elements at play, from a variety of genres. Schwartz (2007: 279) also makes the connection between Chariton and Lysias.
[630] Brethes (2007b).

Aristophanic comedies such as *Thesmophoriazousae*, where Euripides plays director to Agathon and Mnesilochus, and Plautine comedies like *Pseudolus*, where Pseudolus and his slave both impersonate other characters.[631]

Chariton describes the key scenes performed by both actors, in detail. The second actor, after approaching Chaereas in public, 'pretended' (προεφασίζετο, 1.4.4), that the area was too public for their conversation. The word προεφασίζετο underlines the artificiality of the scene. The actor's skills in affecting emotion are displayed in the description of his following actions:

> εἶτα συναγαγὼν τὰς ὀφρῦς καὶ ὅμοιος γενόμενος λυπουμένῳ, μικρὸν δέ τι καὶ δακρύσας
>
> then, knitting his brow, looking like he was grieving, and crying a little (1.4.5)

The actor's false emotions are the most specifically described displays of emotion in the novel, in terms of facial expression, besides the two protagonists and Dionysius. The difference is that the actor chooses his expressions for effect. False grief plays an important role in Euripides' *Helen*, when Helen must convince Theoclymenus of the death of Menelaus (*Helen* 1193-1300). In this case, however, there are no tragic masks to obscure facial expressions. Mime actors did not wear masks;[632] it is possible that by so specifically describing the 'actor's face, Chariton gives his audience an additional, almost subliminal, cue as to what kind of performance he means to reference.[633]

---

[631] Although the suitor from Acragas coaches his actors, they cannot work from a script, as they must interact with people who are not party to the plot. As such, they must improvise, a superficial similarity to the performance reality of improvised mimes.

[632] Athenaeus mentions a Cleon mimaulos τῶν Ἰταλικῶν μίμων ἄριστος γέγονεν αὐτοπρόσωπος ὑποκριτής,'the best of the Italian mimes who display their own features.' (Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 10.452 f.).

[633] It is true that in tragedy facial expressions are described, as well as tears, but I believe in this case, with an unmasked 'real' person the object of such descriptions, a mask is not what comes to mind, but rather the (presumably) exaggerated facial expressions of mime.

Chaereas is convinced by the actor's words and looks and quickly agrees to follow his advice, unwittingly joining the cast of the farce. The young man sends a note to Callirhoe saying that he will be away for the night, then spies on his own house. Chariton chooses this moment to highlight that this scene has been manufactured by the suitor from Acragas, writing 'then the malicious slanderer set the scene' (ὁ δὲ κακοήθης ἐκεῖνος καὶ διάβολος συνέταττε τὴν σκηνήν, 1.4.8)[634]. Again, he uses a term from the theatre: σκηνή. Chaereas' house and its surroundings have become a σκηνή, a stage, on which the suitor of Acragas can set a drama. Chariton makes his performance references increasingly explicit.

When evening falls, Chaereas watches another performance. The first actor, the lover, approaches 'acting as if he was trying to do something in secret, but in everything contriving that he not be missed' (ὑποκρινόμενος μὲν τὸν λαθραίοις ἔργοις ἐπιχειρεῖν προαιρούμενον, πάντα δὲ μηχανώμενος ἵνα μὴ λάθοι, 1.4.9). The verb ὑποκρίνομαι, discussed earlier, is naturally related to putting on a performance or assuming a persona.[635] The actor reads like a character in a comedy, overacting his role in a drama within a drama.

Chariton describes the lover's costume in great detail:

> κόμην εἶχε λιπαρὰν καὶ βοστρύχους μύρων ἀποπνέοντας, ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑπογεγραμμένους, ἱμάτιον μαλακόν,[636] ὑπόδημα λεπτόν· δακτύλιοι βαρεῖς ὑπέστιλβον.
>
> He had glistening hair with perfumed locks, shadowed eyes; a soft cloak and fine slippers; his fingers glittered with heavy rings. (1.4.9)

[634] To highlight the implied theatricality, the Goold (1969: 49) translation reads 'then the wicked villain set the scene *of the drama*.' (My italics.)
[635] Previously discussed in chapter two.
[636] Although μαλακός refers to the character's clothing, the word also has mime connotations. There is a μαλακός character in the *Moicheutria.* See Andreassi (2000).

It is the most detailed description of any character's hair, make-up, and dress in the entire novel, including those of Callirhoe and Chaereas. It is significant that it comes during the most self-consciously theatrical performance in the work. It may well be possible that Chariton is describing the real costume of a mime actor. The 'lover', knowing he has been hired as an actor, dresses for both roles—not just lover but actor playing lover. When the actor approaches the door, he gives 'the usual signal' (τὸ εἰωθὸς σημεῖον). As Porter astutely points out, the reference to a 'usual signal' flags the situation as a common one, perhaps a stock element of mime.[637] As was the case in the foiled first plot, again mime provides an important possible intertext for this scene.

The plot that the Acragantine has devised resembles the 'Adultery Mime', in which a married woman, in the process of entertaining a lover, is interrupted by her dim-witted husband.[638] It seems that the clever woman would conceal her lover somewhere onstage and then attempt to assure her husband of her fidelity.[639] In the plot's various permutations, the husband, apparently the stock character called the *stupidus*,[640] is inevitably a cuckold and a dupe, whether he discovers the concealed lover or not. In some versions where the lover is revealed, slapstick violence would ensue.[641]

In Chariton's novel, Chaereas believes he is about to surprise Callirhoe and her lover, and that is where he has been duped. Chariton plays the suspicious *stupidus*, but the twist in this case is that there has been no adultery in the first place. The 'lover' is a character out of mime, zealously performed as if on the

[637] Porter (2003: 439).
[638] Reynolds (1946: 81-82), Webb (2008: 105).
[639] For an extended treatment of the adultery mime, see Reynolds (1946) and Kehoe (1984).
[640] Kehoe (1984: 90).
[641] Martial 2.72.3-4, 5.61.11-14. Violence in mime is discussed by Reynolds (1946) and Kehoe (1984).

stage, but he does not stay for the final act. He slips away, instead of hiding as Chaereas, perhaps as much primed by the idea of the mime as the audience, may expect. The audience of the novel could laugh as Chaereas falls into the role of a mimic actor, convinced by the performance of another. Earlier Chaereas had been deceived by a stage setting into acting the 'Jealous Woman', and now he falls into something just as humourous as the typical adultery plot.

Humorous, at least, until the slapstick violence generally associated with mime[642] is replaced by a genuine 'deadly' blow. Chaereas is well convinced by the drama constructed around him, playing, in earnest, the role of cuckolded husband. In anger, he assaults his wife, kicking her in the womb.[643] Callirhoe appears to be dead, Chaereas a murderer. He has fallen in exactly with the suitors' scheme,[644] turning comedy to tragedy. For Chariton's audience, such a turn of events would counter their comic expectations, replacing laughter with tears.

In addition, the sudden conclusion of the episode, so soon after the escape of the lover', recalls the chaotic and abrupt ending particular to mime.[645] Cicero, in his *Pro Caelio*, comments that

> *mimi ergo est exitus, non fabulae, in quo cum clausula non invenitur, fugit aliquis e manibus, deinde scabillae concrepant, aulaeum tollitur*

[642] Reynolds (1946: 96), Kehoe (1984: 91-94).
[643] Borgogno (1971: 257-258), Laplace (1980: 111), Hunter (1994: 1064) relate the scene to Menander. Scourfield (2010) argues for connections with Euripides' *Hippolytus* 882-900.
[644] Tricks and schemes were considered standard in mime, as seen in Petronius, *Sat.* 106.1 *nunc mimicis artibus petiti sumus et adumbrata inscriptione derisi*, 'now we are targeted with a mime's art and mocked with a fake inscription', Cicero, *Pro. Rab. Post.* 35 *Audiebamus Alexandream, nunc cogniscimus. Illinc omnes praestigiae, illinc, inquam, omnes fallaciae, omnia denique ab eis mimorum argumenta nata sunt*, 'We used to hear about Alexandria but now we know it first-hand. Thence comes all trickery, thence, I say, comes all intrigues, and thenceforward all mime plots come from those people.' Also Artemidorus, *Oneir*. 1.76. (27).
[645] Petronius' *Satyrica* contains several chaotic and abrupt conclusions of episodes, which Panayotakis (1995: 108, 148) links to mime. For abrupt mime ending see Cicero, *Pro Caelio* 65.

> Therefore this is an exit from mime, not comedy, in that when a conclusion is not found, someone flees from someone's hands, then the cymbals clash and the curtain is taken up.[646]

It is convenient for my argument that Cicero makes clear that this form of exit comes from mime and not comedy.

The suitor from Acragas produces a drama with three acts: the party scene outside of Chaereas' house, the warning from a concerned individual, and the clandestine lovers' meeting. He provides words and actions and his actors wear costumes and adroitly play their scripted roles. Chariton takes the 'specific play within play' paradigm and uses it for first comic but ultimately tragic effect, playing on audience expectation—expectation primed by contemporary performance tropes. With such a comic beginning to the episode, the expectation may have been to read a scene in which Chaereas, as jealous husband, tears apart his house, looking in every typical place for a 'lover' to hide on a stage set, as Callirhoe stands by in confusion. Perhaps, in fact, there was a mime plot that did just that. The *stupidus* could have searched in vain for a non-existent lover.[647] It is possible that such an inversion was one of the possible variants of the Adultery Mime, which could have served as Chariton's inspiration. Although the plotline remains conjecture, the suitors' plot offers opportunities to expand and vary the possibilities of known mime plots.

Adultery Mime and Beyond in Achilles Tatius

[646] Cicero, *Pro Cael.* 65.
[647] Or simply stayed a step behind the lover, always looking in the place where he had hidden last.

Mignogna argues that the final third of *Leucippe and Clitophon* is a remodelling of the typical script of an adultery mime.[648] At that point, travel adventure is replaced with domestic drama, and Clitophon and Leucippe find themselves entangled in the machinations of an adulterous-minded married couple. Achilles Tatius, perhaps pushing the boundaries of genre in his half-serious, half-parodic over-the-top situations and prose, doubles (possibly even triples) the typical plot of the adultery mime. Doubling, in fact, abounds in the final portion, with two sets of adultery situations, two false deaths, two murder accusations, two trials and finally two different sets of chastity tests.

Where in *Callirhoe* the adultery mime plot frames a short though pivotal portion of the first book, in *Leucippe and Clitophon* the components of an adultery mime are expanded and complicated to encompass the final books of the story. Melite's shipwrecked husband Thersander appears alive—and angry to see his wife romantically involved with someone else. Melite does some quick thinking and lies to calm her husband. Thersander's jealousy over Melite does not prevent him from becoming attracted to Leucippe and locking her away for lecherous purposes. Nor do Clitophon's feelings for the resurrected Leucippe keep him from sleeping with Melite once they have both recovered their previous partners. Thersander takes Clitophon to court for adultery, after an episode in which Clitophon attempts to flee in women's clothing. Leucippe manages to escape and take refuge in a temple; eventually both she and Melite must undergo trials to prove their chastity. In the end, the trials are successfully undergone and

[648] Mignogna (1996a: 237), '*il rimodellamento narrativo del copione di un tipico* adultery mime'. Schwartz (2000-2001) and Schwartz (2007) investigate adultery in Achilles Tatius, particularly in a legal context. As with Chariton, New Comedy is a frequent proposed intertext with the adultery episodes, though Heiserman (1977: 129) suggests that the characters in Achilles Tatius are not exact stock comic character types. See Heiserman (1977: 118-30), Crismani (1997), (Laplace 2007: 652-580). Brethes (2007a: esp. 21-23) also notes similarities to Aristophanes.

Leucippe and Clitophon reunited. Despite misunderstandings, bed switching and a court trial, there are no permanent changes in partners—and no consequences for Melite and Clitophon's adultery.

Mignogna suggests that this portion of *Leucippe and Clitophon* could be called an 'adultery novel',[649] a term that well represents both the similarities to and alteration of a typical mime plot. Very recently Ruth Webb has commented on some 'erotic mime' elements in this section.[650] She and I both recognise that the characters involved in this intrigue appear at times to 'operate according to quite different scripts', though I provide a more extended account and suggest the 'scripts' involved are not all from mime.[651] The adultery mime on the page is fleshed out into multiple scenes, which provide the narrative thrust leading to the conclusion of the novel. Although Mignogna initially casts Thersander as the scorned husband ('*marito beffato*') and Melite as the passionate wife ('*donna passionale*'), she acknowledges that each character's role overspills the bounds of their typical mime *personae* as she interprets them. That is to say, Thersander is not simply a buffoonish cuckold, nor is Melite just a scheming adulteress. Their roles are more faceted and reciprocal. Though Melite plays the role of clever adulteress, her husband will attempt the same. Clitophon is a less than willing lover and Leucippe a completely unwilling participant in Thersander's adultery scheme. None of the characters perfectly map onto specific mime character types, though each share characteristics with various ones.[652]

In the same vein, the adultery situations found in the novel are not exact replicas of mime performance. Nonetheless, they appear to be informed by mime

[649] Mignogna (1996a: 241).
[650] Webb (2013).
[651] Webb (2013: 295).
[652] Webb (2013: 292) observes that Achilles Tatius 'combines different [mime] plot types' in his depiction of what she calls a 'triangle' and I would call a 'quadrangle'.

or could have been identified with mime by a reader with a taste for mimic performance. As argued above, mime tropes, particularly the theme of adultery, could have been hinted at in the circumstances of Leucippe's haircut and Clitophon's confession that reading Leucippe's accusatory letter made him feel 'like an adulterer caught in the act' (ὥσπερ ἐπ᾽ αὐτοφώρῳ μοιχὸς κατειλημμένος, 5.19.6). The drama of an adulterer surprised in the act is, of course, the topic of an adultery mime.[653] Perhaps by introducing the idea of adultery in Leucippe's letter and Clitophon's response, Achilles Tatius attempts to alert his audience to the introduction of a mimic plotline. At any rate, Clitophon's statement is one that will resonate through the end of the novel in the actions of Melite, Thersander and Clitophon, as all three attempt to escape being caught in the act.

While the miraculous resurrection of Leucippe fills Clitophon with joy, it also fills him with shame (5.19.6). He writes her a missive in reply to her letter, insisting

> μαθήσῃ τὴν σήν με παρθενίαν μεμιμημένον, εἴ τις ἐστὶ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνδράσι παρθενία,
>
> you will find that I have imitated your virginity, if there be any virginity in men (5.20.5).

If Leucippe plays the role of the mimic *calvus*, then Clitophon plays the role of 'adulterous' wife. His insistence on his (genuine) virginity is similar to the mime wife's *Trugrede*. As in the pseudo-*Trugrede* that Leucippe offered to her mother in the beginning of the novel, Clitophon's sexual continence has slightly more to do with circumstance than intention. It has the added caveat of the definition of 'virginity in men'. That Leucippe believes his protestations is evident in her

[653] Juvenal, *Sat.* 6.41-4.

speech mentioned above, when she calls her 'husband' Clitophon 'faithful and steadfast' (πιστὲ καὶ βέβαιε, 6.16.3).

Leucippe's reappearance after an apparent death at sea presages the arrival of Thersander, who had been presumed dead in the aftermath of a shipwreck. Melite and Clitophon are preparing to drink wine when a servant announces that Thersander is alive and present. Thersander arrives immediately after, while the servant is still explaining the circumstances—as if interrupting a messenger speech. Melite

> ἀνέθορεν ὑπ᾽ ἐκπλήξεως τοῦ παραλόγου[654] καὶ περιβάλλειν ἐπεχείρει τὸν ἄνδρα. ὁ δὲ τὴν μὲν ὡς εἶχεν ὠθεῖ μάλα ἐρρωμένως,
>
> jumped up, thunderstruck at the unusualness of the situation, and tried to embrace her husband; but he thrust her quite violently from him (5.23.5).

Melite's attempted embrace and Thersander's violent response resemble the scene in Chariton where Callirhoe rushes towards her husband in the dark and he answers with the kick that appears to end her life. Both show violence towards wives under the suspicion of adultery. However, Melite and Clitophon's relationship does not become adulterous until Thersander's arrival, when Melite reverts from widow to wife. Initially Melite is blameless, if perhaps a bit lascivious. She is 'married' to Clitophon, after all. However, with the return of Thersander, Melite becomes an adulterous wife.[655]

Unlike Chariton's Chaereas who finds no lover in his home, Thersander instantly lights on Clitophon, shouting ὁ μοιχὸς οὗτος, 'this is the *moechus*!' (5.23.5).[656] The term, though it could be used as a simple slur, brings to mind the

[654] Again, *ekplexis* and *paralogos* are used close together, as in 3.15.6. See chapter five for further on *ekplexis.*
[655] Webb (2013: 295).
[656] Laplace (2007: 644-645) places this episode within the realm of New Comedy.

character of the *moechus* in mime. Like the typical jealous husband in mime,[657] Thersander follows his accusation with a physical attack:

> ῥαπίζει με κατὰ κόρρης πληγὴν θυμοῦ γέμουσαν. ἑλκύσας δὲ τῶν τριχῶν, ῥάσσει πρὸς τοὔδαφος, καὶ προσπίπτων κατακόπτει με πληγαῖς. ἐγὼ δὲ ὥσπερ ἐν μυστηρίῳ μηδὲν ᾔδειν, μήτε ὅστις ἄνθρωπος ἦν, μήτε οὗ χάριν ἔτυπτεν, ὑποπτεύσας δέ τι κακὸν εἶναι, ἐδεδοίκειν ἀμύνασθαι, καίτοι δυνάμενος.
>
> He struck me a blow on the temple, full of fury. Seizing me by the hair, he dashed me to the floor, and, falling upon me, rained blows on me. I knew nothing at all, as though I were undergoing initiation in a mystery cult, not who the man was or why he was beating me; though, suspecting that there was something wrong, I was afraid to defend myself, though I was capable of it. (5.23.5)

The description is humorous—Thersander pulls Clitophon's hair and beats him, while Clitophon lies stunned and helpless. Dragging someone by the hair is a simple slapstick theatre trick and could have been one of the forms of violence seen in mime. Achilles Tatius accentuates the comic factor in this scene through Clitophon's weak verbal defence of his weak physical defence. Through prose Achilles Tatius can give his audience both the physical, violent comedy of mime and the more verbally sophisticated irony of Clitophon's interpretation of such violence.

A similar situation occurs later in the novel, when Thersander once again attacks Clitophon:

> παίει με κατὰ τῶν προσώπων μάλα βιαίως καὶ ἐπάγει δευτέραν· οἱ δὲ τῶν ῥινῶν αἵματος ἔρρεον κρουνοί· ὅλον γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὸν θυμὸν εἶχεν ἡ πληγή. ὡς δὲ καὶ τρίτην ἀπροφυλάκτως ἔπαισε, λανθάνει μου τῷ στόματι περὶ τοὺς ὀδόντας προσπταίσας τὴν χεῖρα, καὶ τρωθεὶς τοὺς δακτύλους μόλις τὴν χεῖρα συνέστειλεν ἀνακραγών. καὶ οἱ ὀδόντες ἀμύνουσι τὴν τῶν ῥινῶν ὕβριν· τιτρώσκουσι γὰρ αὐτοῦ τοὺς παίοντας δακτύλους, καὶ ἃ πεποίηκεν ἔπαθεν ἡ χείρ.
>
> He gave me a rather violent blow on the face and followed it with a second, so that streams of blood flowed from my nostrils, as the blow held his whole fury. He aimed a third, but taking less care in its

[657] Martial 2.72.3-4.

> direction, he missed my face and struck his hand on the teeth, and wounding his fingers, he drew back his hand with difficulty as he cried out; and so my teeth avenged the insult offered to my nose, wounding his assaulting fingers, and the striking hand suffered what it had doled out. (8.1.3-4)

The streams of blood from nostrils are Homeric and yet could also be mimic. The Suetonius anecdote about the amount of blood expelled by the actors in *Laureolus* shows that bloodletting could appear onstage.[658] There is less physical comedy in this episode, besides perhaps the humour in a face injuring the hand that struck it (another easy act of physical theatre). Rather, it is Clitophon's interpretation of events, in which his face becomes an avenging combatant instead of a punching bag, that makes the scene successfully humorous.[659] Clitophon's bloody nose seems to combine literary and subliterary allusions in what seems to be a comic mode. Instead of focusing on the 'bathetic' quality of a vague Homeric allusion, it is perhaps more profitable to focus on the way that Clitophon may be attempting to elevate his suffering to an epic level.[660]

Clitophon's feeble verbal attempts to defend his cowardly response to physical violence underscore his characterisation as soft and effeminate. His verbal dexterity and physical cowardice accentuate his similarity to the mimic *moechus*. The *moechus*, described as made-up, oiled and perfumed in Chariton (*Callirhoe* 1.4.9), is often associated with femininity and softness, as in Juvenal, Ovid and Apuleius.[661] Melite, also, calls Clitophon both a eunuch and a feminine man (εὐνοῦχε καὶ ἀνδρόγυνε, 5.25.8,). Her accusations occur, however, when

[658] Suetonius, *Calig.* 57.4.
[659] It is at this point Gaselee (1969: 390-91) observes that the reader 'will by this time have come to the conclusion that the hero of the romance is a coward of the purest water'.
[660] Laplace (2007: 436-437) implies that the interaction between Thersander and Clitophon resembles burlesque.
[661] For the image of the effeminate μοιχός, Apuleius, *Met.* 9.27, *mollis*, 'soft' and Juvenal 6.023-25, *suspectus tibi sit, quanto vox mollior etquo saepius in teneris haerebit dextera lumbis,* 'he should be more suspected, the softer his voice and the more often his right hand lingers by his delicate loins'*;* cf. Mignogna (1996a: 239 n 29).

she berates him for refusing to consummate their marriage. She complains that 'my husband… has believed me guilty of adultery on your account—a fruitless, sexless adultery' (ὁ ἀνήρ... μοιχείαν κατέγνωκεν ἐπὶ σοί, μοιχείαν ἄκαρπον, μοιχείαν ἀναφρόδιτον, 5.25.5). In this case, the femininity of Clitophon the *moechus* is offered as the reason for a lack of true adultery!

Or rather, a lack of true adultery up to this point. Melite is aware that Leucippe lives and that her own husband is still alive, so there can be no marriage for her and Clitophon. But this does not keep her from encouraging him to 'give over yourself to me now for the first and last time' (ἀπόδος σεαυτὸν τήμερον πρῶτα καὶ ὕστατα, 5.26.7). She presents various arguments for their union, including that if Clitophon had never met Melite, he would never have come to her home and never found Leucippe again (5.26.8). Clitophon describes Melite's 'philosophising words' (ταῦτα φιλοσοφήσασα) and claims 'for indeed Love teaches rhetoric' (διδάσκει γὰρ ὁ Ἔρως καὶ λόγους, 5.27.1). He falls for Melite's words in much the same way he had hoped Leucippe would fall for his in the first book.

Although Melite seduces him despite the knowledge that she will be committing adultery, Clitophon does not describe his actions in that light. Instead, he seems to take his teaching from the same 'master of rhetoric', saying he feared the wrath of Eros 'and anything that took place was no longer marriage but rather like a medicine to an aching heart' (καὶ ὅτι οὐδὲ γάμος ἔτι τὸ πραττόμενον ἦν, ἀλλὰ φάρμακον ὥσπερ ψυχῆς νοσούσης, 5.27.2) Nevertheless, Melite's mention of a previously 'fruitless adultery' (5.25.5) and Clitophon's earlier mention of feeling caught in the act by Leucippe suggest that his evening with Melite presents another potential adultery—Clitophon betrays Leucippe, in

the spirit, if not in the letter, of the law. Clitophon, at last, becomes a μοιχός in earnest. In book six, Thersander tells Leucippe, 'I think you must be a whore, since you love an adulterer' (ἐγὼ μέν σε καὶ πεπορνεῦσθαι δοκῶ· καὶ γὰρ μοιχὸν φιλεῖς, 6.20.2).

Melite releases Clitophon from the chains placed on him by Thersander and helps him escape. He explains 'she dressed me up as herself' (ἐσκεύασέ με ὡς ἑαυτήν, 6.1.3). Once again, a man is placed in a dress to allay suspicions. Melite claims that Clitophon looks even more beautiful in her clothes. She says, 'you are like the Achilles I once saw in a picture' (τοιοῦτον Ἀχιλλέα ποτ' ἐθεασάμην ἐν γραφῇ, 6.1.3). For Mignogna, the scene is perhaps a mimic parody of Achilles' famous cross-dressing.[662] She refers to a story about the hero Achilles, in which his mother Thetis disguises him as a young girl on the island of Scyros, in order to keep him from fighting (and dying) in the Trojan War. Helen Morales calls the Achilles of Scyros episode one of pantomime's 'transvestite myths'.[663] It is possible that the combination of mythological burlesque and adultery mime are an intentional choice on the part of Achilles Tatius to play a joke on Clitophon, who is no hero avoiding an ill-fated war, but a completely unheroic μοιχός dressed in drag to avoid an angry husband. At any rate there are mimic undertones to the scene, which bring theatre to the fore through the act of costuming a character in a manner that highlights a myth found on the stage, even as it seems to recast the story in a mimic mould. As in the allusion to his epic bloody nose, Clitophon may try to place himself among epic heroes, only to land upon the mimic (or pantomimic) stage.

[662] Mignogna (1996a: 239), 'la scena avrebbe potuto ricordare ai lettori anche una parodio mimica del célèbre episodio'.
[663] Morales (2004: 73).

When Thersander catches Clitophon attempting to flee dressed as a woman, Clitophon reports

> ἔτι μᾶλλον οὖν ὁ Θέρσανδρος ἐδεινοπάθει, ῥητὰ μὲν καὶ ἄρρητα βοῶν, τὸν μοιχόν, τὸν λωποδύτην· ἄγει δέ με εἰς τὸ δεσμωτήριον καὶ παραδίδωσιν, ἔγκλημα μοιχείας ἐπιφέρων.
>
> Thersander then took to yet more complaints, shouting utterable and unutterable things, 'adulterer', 'thief'; he then dragged me to prison and handed me over to the law, laying a charge of adultery against me. (6.5.3)

Again Clitophon is painted as a μοιχός, and further, brought up on charges of adultery. The situation recalls the adultery mime as described by Choricius in which the cuckolded husband takes his wife and her lover to court.[664]

Clitophon's characterisation as an effeminate μοιχός continues in Thersander's court speech. Thersander calls him a male prostitute, πόρνος, and adds

> τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ μεῖζον ἀτύχημα, ὅτι τοιοῦτον ηὗρε τὸν ἐρώμενον, ὃς πρὸς μὲν γυναῖκας ἄνδρας μιμεῖται, γυνὴ δὲ γίγνεται πρὸς ἄνδρας.
>
> And what is even more unfortunate is that the lover she chose is one who pretends manliness among women, while he is a woman among men. (8.10.9.)

Morales claims Thersander's speech, 'casts [Clitophon] self-consciously as a character in a mime, one who in a continuation of the Achilles on Scyros image, plays the transvestite.'[665] I would specify that in this case pantomime, or perhaps mythological burlesque, is a more appropriate comparison than mime. Clitophon's situation may also recall the Achilles on Scyros myth, in more than just the transvestism. Achilles impregnates the girl Deidamia while in his

[664] Choricius, *Ap.m.* 30. Schwartz (2007 and (2010) discuss adultery and law courts in the novels, Schwartz (2000-2001) specifically studies Clitophon as an adulterer.
[665] Morales (2004: 76).

feminine disguise, and Clitophon has just made love to Melite, making both characters men among women.

Before Melite seduces the incarcerated Clitophon, she rails at him about the fact that her slave Lacaena is in fact Clitophon's lost love Leucippe. She accuses him of knowing about Leucippe all along, claiming 'a pair of magicians, male and female, working against me: one of you was laughing at me the whole time' (ὦ ζεῦγος κατ᾽ ἐμοῦ γοήτων, ἀνδρὸς καὶ γυναικός. ὁ μὲν τοσοῦτόν μου χρόνον κατεγέλα, 5.25.3). The scene bears similarities to the anger of the jealous mistress in the *Moicheutria*, who rails at her captured slave whom she wanted as her lover.[666] There are, of course, major differences— it is not Melite who has put Clitophon in chains, and shortly she will relent. Clitophon must answer to a jealous husband *and* a jealous wife. Achilles Tatius' double adultery mime ups the stakes for both protagonists, as they are both objects of desire and objects of jealousy. Happily for Clitophon and Leucippe, Melite is not as violent a version of the jealous woman as in the *Moicheutria* and is much more persuasive. She successfully uses her powers of speech both to win a night with Clitophon and to soothe her jealous husband.

After Thersander's thunderous arrival, he leaves the scene, giving Melite her final (successful) opportunity to seduce Clitophon. Upon her husband's return, Melite makes another speech related to the adultery mime genre, a *Trugrede.* Achilles Tatius writes that Melite 'acted convincingly' (ὑποκριναμένη πιθανῶς, 6.10.2)—translated by Tim Whitmarsh as 'a plausible piece of acting'.[667] As in Chariton, the verb ὑποκρίνομαι has theatrical connotations, made all the more explicit as Melite delivers a speech from mime. Plausibility

[666] Webb (2013: 296) also identifies Melite with elements of the *Jealous Mistress* plot.
[667] Whitmarsh (2001: 104).

(τὸ πιθανόν) is a crucial characteristic of rhetoric.[668] In addition, scholia on Greek tragedy comment when something is unconvincing (τό ἀπίθανον).[669] Melite is a consummate performer, capable of appearing convincing while telling an outright lie.

Melite's speech in defense of her honour brings to mind Callirhoe's speech in defense of her own, when confronted by her husband Chaereas. Where the novelty in Callirhoe's mimic *Trugrede* was its truthfulness, Melite's seems to follow the usual pattern of mime in its patent falseness. As in mime, her protestations of loyalty to her husband are belied by her sexual encounter with Clitophon. Melite's adultery plot diverges from the typical in that she is also a deceived party. Thersander's interest in Leucippe turns *him* into an attempted adulterer, who must deceive his wife. The steps he takes—kidnapping Leucippe, locking her in a hut guarded by Sosthenes, then hiring an actor to convince Clitophon that Leucippe is dead, poisoned by Melite—are dangerously over the top. Mignogna compares *Leucippe and Clitophon* with the *Moicheutria*, which she calls '*un simile intrigo adulterino in versione* noir.'[670] Although the *Moicheutria* at first seems very dark, due to the wife's murderous intentions and the fact that it seems for a moment as if her schemes have come to fruition, nevertheless, by the end of the scene it seems as if no one has died in earnest. *Leucippe and Clitophon* is lighter yet in tone. Although Melite is very displeased to discover the one-sided nature of her attachment to Clitophon, she does not punish him or her slave Leucippe, whom she has already saved from harsh treatment.

[668] Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1355b15-16, 1356b26.
[669] Heath (1987: 112).
[670] Mignogna (1996a: 237).

Thersander, on the other hand, is Melite's dark mirror—while her behavior in seducing Clitophon (despite the return of her husband and the discovery of Leucippe) is gender-subversive and morally questionable, his behavior rivals the mistress in the *Moicheutria*, though his plans are even more byzantine. As in the *Moicheutria*, Thersander's dastardly plans are foiled, but there is still a very strong sense of a serious threat—to Leucippe. Where Clitophon's adventures have involved comically dodging the amatory predations of his 'wife' Melite, Leucippe has suffered far more seriously. For refusing one potential lover, Sosthenes, she has all of her hair cut off and is bound with chains. When Thersander arrives, he imprisons her before he even tries to convince her to love him. When he calls Clitophon an adulterer, Leucippe fires back, 'then you call Clitophon an adulterer when you are an adulterer yourself?' (εἶτα Κλειτοφῶντα μοιχὸν καλεῖς, αὐτὸς μοιχὸς ὤν; 6.21.2). Leucippe is given the line that makes the double (or triple) adultery plots explicit and exposes the hypocrisy of the entire proceedings.

When Clitophon hears the (false) news that Leucippe has been poisoned, he resolves to plead guilty to her murder (7.6.3).[671] His roundabout attempt at suicide recalls Chaereas' genuine confession of guilt for harming his wife in *Callirhoe.* Just as Chaereas' speech failed to reach his rhetorical goals, Clitophon's speech seems unconvincing. Clitophon's confession lacks logic: he claims he was in love with and still loves Leucippe, but was bribed with marriage by Melite and agreed to kill his lover (7.7.5-6). He admits that he wishes to be sent after the woman he loves (7.7.6). Clitophon's self-incrimination could suggest that Achilles Tatius means to attempt another sort of mime-doubling.

[671] Leucippe's final *Scheintod* also appears to be a superfluous reason to bring Clitophon to court. A potentially climactic courtroom scene concerning Clitophon and Melite's adultery is already set to take place.

Instead of two of the same plots, in this episode he combines the crime and punishment motif with the sort of adultery charges that Choricius claims belong to mime.[672]

Within the trial Clitophon, Thersander, Clinias and the judge all have the opportunity to make speeches with rhetorical flourish. Although Mignogna places the court case solely in the realm of mime, it would be better to acknowledge that mime is but one of the influences found in the episode.[673] The conventions of the adultery mime genre may have given Achilles Tatius the opportunity to bring about a trial, during which he could draw on multiple genres. When Clinias speaks in Clitophon's defense, he highlights the inconsistencies in Clitophon's self-condemnation. It seems a unique circumstance that a defendant would plead his own guilt and another person would give a speech in the defendant's defence—or perhaps it is just the sort of paradoxical situation that could have been the stuff of declamation.[674] Clinias' speech appears to follow a typical defence speech formula, and contains rhetorical questions that weaken Clitophon's argument (7.9.8, 7.9.9). Thersander's speech also follows court speech formulae, also using a string of rhetorical questions to make his case (7.11.6-8).

Clitophon is judged guilty and is to be questioned under torture as to the participation of Melite. Clitophon is stripped and hung above the ground, as attendants bring forward fire and the wheel (7.12.2). He is briefly placed in the sort of situation that Leucippe had welcomed earlier. It looks as if Clitophon instead will become a kind of martyrlike spectacle. In the end, Clitophon escapes

[672] Choricius, *Apol. mim*. 30. See also Philo *leg.* 359, Ammianus Marcellinus 30.4.21.
[673] Mignogna (1996a: 240). Mignogna (1996a: 240 n 30) does note, quite correctly, that the trials in Chariton, Heliodorus and Apuleius all stem from '*un intrigo adulterino'*.
[674] Russell (1983).

torture. His release from the cords perhaps anticipates Leucippe's similar freedom from the threat of such abuse. When Leucippe escapes and takes shelter in the temple of Artemis (7.12.1ff), the act recalls the *Suppliants* of both Aeschyus and Euripides. Aeschylus' play is the more similar of the two, as it features women wishing to escape from unwanted relationships with men—the Danaids attempt to avoid marriage to their Egyptian cousins. Leucippe's request for sanctuary is reported by a messenger and heard by Clitophon. He rushes towards the temple—claiming

> ἐγὼ δὲ ἐξάλλομαι μετὰ τῶν δεσμῶν εἰς ἀέρα καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερὸν ὡς ἀπὸ μηχανῆς βληθεὶς ἐπετόμην
>
> I leaped up with my chains, in the air, and flew off to the temple as if hurled from the *mêchanê*. (7.15.3)

Tim Whitmarsh translates ὡς ἀπὸ μηχανῆς as 'as if from a catapult', and while that is a valid interpretation, the term *mêchanê* has clear theatrical connotations, just as the term does in Heliodorus. These connotations could resonate with readers who have noted Leucippe's 'tragic' situation. Clitophon is recaptured and beaten before he can reach the temple, but Sostratus, Clinias, a crowd of bystanders and even the high priest intervene to allow him to continue. The description of a chase and a beating resonate with mimic comedy, following on the heels of a tragic scenario. In this case, the appearance of Leucippe seems to negate Clitophon's arrest for her murder, and her father Sostratus' arrival keeps Leucippe from requiring temple sanctuary as a slave. Although Clitophon's metaphorical *mêchanê* does not instantly lead to the fortuitous conclusion of his and Leucippe's predicament, as often happens in tragedy, it does precipitate the resolution of their difficulties.

The genres collide again when Thersander bursts into the temple and once more attacks Clitophon, as described above. The tragic action of Leucippe's supplication is shattered by Thersander's disregard for the sanctity of the temple, evidenced by his assault on Clitophon. Clitophon cowardly complains that Thersander is not playing by the rules, 'Where may we yet flee from violence? Where would we take refuge? To which of the gods, if not Artemis?' (Ποῖ φύγωμεν ἔτι τοὺς βιαίους; ποῖ καταδράμωμεν; ἐπὶ τίνα θεῶν μετὰ τὴν Ἄρτεμιν; 8.2.1). Although he perhaps speaks to the crowd as 'we', the use of the first person plural suggests that it is he and Leucippe who are taking sanctuary, not Leucippe alone. As Clitophon explained earlier, the conditions for taking sanctuary in the temple include being a woman. By placing himself under the same protection that Leucippe has placed herself, he makes himself a beleaguered serving woman. His identification with Leucippe is strengthened by the conclusion of his speech:

> τὴν Ἰωνίαν Σκυθίαν πεποίηκας, καὶ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ῥεῖ τὰ ἐν Ταύροις αἵματα. λαβὲ καὶ ξίφος κατ᾽ ἐμοῦ. καίτοι τί δέῃ σιδήρου; τὰ τοῦ ξίφους πεποίηκεν ἡ χείρ. ἀνδροφόνος αὕτη καὶ μιαιφόνος δεξιὰ τοιαῦτα δέδρακεν οἷα ἐκ φόνου γίνεται.
>
> You have turned Ionia into Scythia, Thersander, and here in Ephesus flows blood that flows in Tauris. Come, use your sword against me! But what need is there of steel? Your hand has done the work of a sword. Indeed, that murderous and bloodstained hand has performed such things as come from slaughter. (8.2.3-4)

Clitophon alludes to human sacrifice at Tauris, which may recall Leucippe's *Iphigenia at Tauris*-style sacrifice in book three.[675] It also suggests that Clitophon himself is using a plot from tragedy to characterise a moment in his own life. As in Leucippe's martyr speech, Clitophon invites Thersander to use his sword against him. However, where in Leucippe's speech the list of torture

[675] See chapter five.

implements were equally (if not increasingly) severe, Clitophon follows his sword comment with some backtracking, claiming a sword isn't necessary and that Thersander can simply use his hand. Clitophon, it seems, is a less eager martyr. His 'martyrdom' is only an act—his shouts bring a crowd, who drag Thersander from the temple and save him from further physical attacks (8.1-3). The relocating of tragic plotlines to less exalted people and circumstances is a feature of tragic burlesque. The allusions to *IT*, in an incongruous situation, would seem to fall into a style similar to that of the *Charition* mime.[676]

Conclusion

Both novels borrow from the adultery mime, though Chariton's version seems modelled on the mime's structure while Achilles Tatius tends to use and subvert stock character types and situations. In both cases, it is less useful to search only for one-to-one correspondences than it is to note what does and does not fit the mimic mould. It is possible that deviations from a standard plot can say more about the novelists' creativity, and may suggest that the deviations could play with the expectations of a theatrically minded reader. Performance genres act as a language within the text that can speak both to the reader and to the characters in the novels. In Chariton, Chaereas' downfall is due to his inability to distinguish performance from reality. Is he too familiar with the adultery mime trope and too ready to see it in real life, or is he unfamiliar with the mime and therefore hoodwinked? The answer could hinge on one's interpretation of the 'usual sign' that Chariton claims the actor makes at the door

[676] See chapters one, four and five. Hall (2013a: 136-8) observes that this scene takes place in Ephesus and that we have some evidence for the popularity of *IT* in that city, specifically a wall-painting that appears to depict Iphigenia and Thoas. Strocka (1977: 48, 54, fig. 68), Jucker (1988: 119-120), Linant de Bellefonds (1990: no. 64), Burrell (2005: 233).

of Chaereas' home. Is the sign 'usual' to Chaereas, or to the reader, or both? In any case, there is an assumption that the sign will be familiar to the reader, however the reader interprets Chaereas' response.

In Achilles Tatius, the adultery mime is one aspect of a pastiche of genres ranging from mime, possibly pantomime, and tragedy to tragic burlesque. It is over-the-top, a double or triple adultery scenario, and highly unlikely to reflect any specific adultery mime performance. Instead, the episode reflects the ways in which contemporary, subliterary performance genres could be used to enliven the common romantic intrigues found in all the extant Greek novels. The theatrically minded reader's experience of Clitophon's foibles and Leucippe's misfortunes would be 'enriched' by reading adultery mime in these episodes.

7. An Athenian Story: Cnemon's Tale

Introduction

In chapter three, I discussed Cnemon's reactions to Calasiris' inset narrative. This chapter will map the theatrical elements of Cnemon's own story through the use of direct speech, mime and tragic elements and law court drama. Cnemon the Athenian is a relatively minor character in the *Aethiopica*. The protagonists meet him very early on in the novel: he shares in their adventures briefly, serves as the internal audience for Calasiris' story and then is left to a happy ending (and wedding) in Chemmis while the other main characters continue on for another four books. One could claim that the most important thing Cnemon does in the entire story is to encourage Calasiris to tell his tale, since it is through Calasiris that the reader learns who Chariclea and Theagenes are, and how they came to Egypt. But long before Calasiris speaks to Cnemon, and through him, to the reader, Cnemon is given an inset narrative of his own. Cnemon's story is a fascinating example of the complexities of Heliodorus' work. Even an ancillary character like Cnemon has a rich, thematically resonant backstory. John Morgan calls Cnemon's story a 'novella', in relation to its continuation of themes from the main body of the narrative, suggesting that this is a 'double-plot' as seen in many a modern novel, where a subplot is often present to be compared and contrasted with the primary narrative.[677] His interpretation is a response to that of J.J. Winkler, who suggested that the story shows a straightforward, naïve narrator in contrast with the convolutions of the

[677] Morgan (1989a: 113). As Ismene Lada-Richards has pointed out to me, this is also a technique found in Hellenistic/neoteric *epyllia*, where there is often an 'inset' narrative that parallels the outer story, with developments that illuminate developments and themes in the outer narrative, for example Catullus 64, with the inset narrative of the abandonment of Ariadne by Theseus.

main narrative.[678] It is possible to incorporate both interpretations. Cnemon may not be quite as naïve a narrator as Winkler implies, but his story can still be contrasted with Calasiris' tale, especially since he is Calasiris' audience. Morgan observes that Cnemon's story is sophisticated in the way in which the themes of its plot illuminate those of the greater narrative, but credit for this is due to the author, not the character. I add that the style of Cnemon's story also serves to highlight elements of the greater narrative, particularly the emphasis on performances.[679] Cnemon characterises his story as a piece of theatre, preparing the reader for the theatricality of the rest of the novel.

I first present a brief summary of Cnemon's story (1.9-1.18; continued at 2.8.4-10; summarised by Cnemon at 6.2):

> Demainete, a young woman, pretends to be in love with her older husband, Aristippus, but in fact lusts after his son, Cnemon. When Cnemon rebuffs her advances, she accuses him of kicking her in her (pregnant) belly. This accusation estranges son from father. Then, Demainete orders her slave girl Thisbe to seduce Cnemon, and to convince him that Demainete is having an adulterous affair. Cnemon prepares to catch the pair in the act and kill the adulterer, but when he bursts into the room, sword in hand, he finds his father in bed with his wife. Cnemon is put on trial for the attempted murder of his father, and exiled.
>
> Demainete continues to pine for Cnemon. Thisbe, afraid that she will begin to resent the slave's actions in Cnemon's downfall, decides to plot against her mistress. She convinces Demainete that Cnemon has remained in Athens at the home of his lover Arsinoe, the flute-girl. She promises to install Demainete in Arsinoe's bed so that Cnemon will come to her instead. Thisbe then tells Aristippus that Demainete is having an affair and offers to help him catch her in the act. Thisbe orchestrates for Aristippus to find Demainete in another's bed, and claims that the (non-existent) lover has gotten away. Demainete is arrested, but throws herself into the pit in the Akademia.
>
> Later in book two, Cnemon returns to his story and explains that Arsinoe, angry at Thisbe for stealing her wealthy lover Nausikles,

[678] Winkler (1982: 106-109). Winkler does not disparage Cnemon's 'well-made' tale, rather he views it as simpler than the story's other narratives.
[679] Whitmarsh (2011: 234) mentions that the theatrical language in Heliodorus is often used to reflect on the nature of narrative. See also Paulsen (1992: 148-149).

> reveals Thisbe's plot to Demainete's family. Aristippus is put on trial as an accessory in Demainete's death and is exiled. Cnemon sets off to pursue Thisbe, who had fled to avoid interrogation under torture. A tablet found on Thisbe's body explains that she was kidnapped by Thyamis' robber band and placed in the cave.

As Morgan has drawn out so well, the temporal and plot convolutions in Cnemon's story are not out of keeping with the novel's non-linear plot formation, particularly in the first half of the work. Though told by a single narrator, the story also contains dialogue and an embedded narrative—Cnemon quotes various characters and reports what he heard from his friend Charias, who fills him in on the second part of the story, for which he was not present.[680] The inclusion of multiple voices and perspectives gives the story depth and helps lay out the events in a reader's mind in greater detail. The moments of direct speech also add to the theatrical nature of the story itself. Although direct speech, in general, is not evidence enough to suggest performance or performance influences, the moments of direct speech in Cnemon's story appear specially crafted to animate the narrative and produce short scenes that appear, to me, to be a series a theatrical vignettes. Direct speech comes at moments of high emotion or of deception—or a combination of the two—and it is often followed by an action. This serves to offer the reader a living image of the action that takes place. Shadi Bartsch and Emile Feuillâtre both refer to the 'animation' of Heliodorus' descriptions, and here I believe we see that same sense of movement in other less overtly descriptive aspects of the text.[681]

The importance of direct speech, for the reader, begins within the larger narrative. Cnemon's story comes early in book one, before the reader, who receives little help from the narrator, has any certain knowledge of the two

[680] Morgan (1989: 100, 105).
[681] Feuillâtre (1966: 24), Bartsch (1989: 122ff).

protagonists. The little 'hard' knowledge the reader can glean (as opposed to knowledge inferred from description), comes from the voices of the characters themselves. After the bewildering opening to the novel, the young unnamed couple fall into the hands of a gang of bandits. The couple speak to each other and the reader learns their names from their dialogue: Theagenes and Chariclea. Just when it seems as if an explanation for their predicament is at hand, they address a fellow prisoner, who is also Greek, and ask for his story.

Cnemon's tale is a moment of prolongation, stretching out the suspense for the reader with a backstory bait-and-switch.[682] It is also our first straightforward introduction to a character in the narrative. The reader is immediately given his name and his hometown—two of the most basic units of information used in the ancient world to define one's self to others[683]—and therefore has somewhere upon which to begin to base assumptions about his character. Knowledge of Cnemon as an Athenian instantly colours his words, even before he tells his tale. Cnemon asks his interlocutors, 'Why do you batter and prise open these doors, to quote from the tragedians?' (τί ταῦτα κινεῖς κἀναμοχλεύεις; τοῦτο δὴ τὸ τῶν τραγῳδῶν, 1.8.7). The phrase, from Euripides' *Medea*,[684] reveals Cnemon has an acquaintance with Attic theatre. In a non-Athenian this knowledge may appear to be an indicator of a love of drama, but for Cnemon it also supports his just-revealed Athenian citizenship. It is possible that knowledge of this line need not represent a deep familiarity with tragedy. It is possible it had entered public consciousness in the way that some lines from

[682] Morgan (1989: 103-104). Winkler (1982: 103) discusses more generally Heliodorus' use of postponement as a narrative technique.
[683] For instance, Chariton of Aphrodisias and Heliodorus of Emesa.
[684] Euripides, *Medea* 1317.

Shakespeare have done today.[685] Even if it were a famous line, Cnemon's decision to use it and announce its tragic pedigree suggests that he means to use it to say something about himself. As we are dealing with Heliodorus, a tragic quotation may not be as simple as it seems.

It is perhaps fitting that a man from the birthplace of tragedy has tragedy on his lips and in his life.[686] The *Medea* quotation takes his story into the realm of drama, as does his next sentence; 'This would not be the time to introduce a new theme into your story, of my misfortunes' (οὐκ ἐν καιρῷ γένοιτ' ἂν ἐπεισόδιον ὑμῖν τῶν ὑμετέρων τἀμὰ ἐπεισφέρειν κακά, 1.8.7). The ancient meaning of ἐπεισόδιον has been debated.[687] The Aristotelian definition seems to be the portion of a tragedy that falls between two choral songs, and to which Gilbert adds also 'any action that is a subordinate but necessary component of the integral action of the play'.[688] A more general ancient definition may have been 'interpolation' or 'digression'.[689] The context of Cnemon's comment leaves the term open to interpretation. He claims it is not the time, οὐκ ἐν καιρῷ, for the introduction of a new ἐπεισόδιον. Does he mean that his story is not necessary to the greater narrative, or is generally not in keeping with the narrative, or something else entirely? The line also may have a self-reflexive dimension, through which the author / narrator acknowledges the reader's surprise in the shift of focus— for the reader, 'it isn't the time' to learn about a new character, considering how little they've learned about the first few. The fact that he *does*

[685] For example, 'to be, or not to be' (Shakespeare, *Hamlet* 3.1.56).
[686] Cnemon's status as a character interested in and associated with tragedy has been explored extensively by Paulsen (1992: 82-110). See also Oudot (1992). Cnemon's interest in the theatrical is discussed in chapter three.
[687] Walden (1894: 39-40), Montes Cala (1992: 222-226), Whitmarsh (2011: 236).
[688] Gilbert (1949: 64).
[689] Gilbert (1949: 56-64), Friedrich (1983: 34-52), contra Nickau (1966) who places additional emphasis on functionality.

tell his story belies the fact that the ἐπεισόδιον is untimely or out of keeping. The way that Cnemon relegates his misfortunes to a mere coda in the greater tragedy of Theagenes and Chariclea heightens the audience's expectations for the story they will eventually hear, but also could suggest that Cnemon's story, and the protagonists', are akin to tragic performances. For my purposes I focus on the manner in which it casts Cnemon's narrative as an additional theme to a tragedy in progress, as one ἐπεισόδιον of many in the greater 'theatrical' production of the entire novel.

Cnemon's tale is itself presented as a series of performances. Winkler's emphasis on Heliodorus as an author interested in the mechanics of reading can perhaps be expanded to include Heliodorus as an author also interested in the mechanics of performance. In his preamble to his story, Cnemon voices the first direct quotation of classical tragedy in conjunction with the idea of life as a form of theatre. His story is theatrical in both plot content and presentation, and his preamble prepares the reader for a tragic narrative. The episode, though in broad strokes similar to Euripides' *Hippolytus,*[690] has much in common with themes from mime, such as the adultery mime discussed in the previous chapter and the dark plotting of the *Moicheutria*. Ruth Webb very briefly mentions some of these similarities in her recent discussion of mime in the novels.[691] I study Cnemon's tale in greater detail, particularly its general theatricality, which goes beyond tragedy and mime. Cnemon's trial and unique situation also recall themes from oratorical performances associated with the first and 'second' sophistic, as well as the style of forensic rhetoric. I argue Cnemon's tale introduces the reader to

[690] Feuillâtre (1966: 118), Fusillo (1991: 39), Paulsen (1992: 88).
[691] Webb (2013: 293). Webb and I have independently reached similar conclusions.

the idea of a theatrical narrative, effectively 'training' the reader in how to respond to the remainder of Heliodorus' highly theatrical text.

Subliterary Plotting

The beginning of the story seems to support the characterisation of his tale as an Attic tragedy, with Demainete's Phaedra-like fixation with her husband's son. That she appears to refer to him as 'young Hippolytus' (ὁ νέος Ἱππόλυτος, 1.10.2), accuses him of violence when he refuses her, and effects an estrangement between father and son gives the narrative the general flavour of the Phaedra/Hippolytus tragic storyline, best known to us through the only extant tragedy on the subject, Euripides' *Hippolytus*.[692] In a footnote in the Budé text, Maillon claims Heliodorus shows bad taste in allowing Demainete to suggest that her situation resembles tragedy.[693] This sort of value judgment reveals a scholarly bias towards considering tragedy as inherently high-minded and inviolable, instead of acknowledging tragic topics as ones that could be versatile. It is more interesting to wonder how a reader would receive Demainete's statement—is it humorous to compare Cnemon's scheming stepmother with the tragic Phaedra? In addition, the Hippolytus story had a *Nachleben* after the heyday of Classical tragedy. There are South Italian vases related to Hippolytus dating from the fourth century.[694] In addition, Lucian mentions Phaedra in a list of female pantomime characters.[695] The reference to Hippolytus need not only bring to mind Euripides' text. Cnemon's earlier tragic quotation is also Euripidean, and also from a play about a woman scorned whose reaction brings

[692] Pausanias 1.22.1 notes the popularity of the myth.
[693] Lumb and Rattenbury (1960 15 n 1), 'Héliodore commet une faute de goût'
[694] Taplin (2007: 130-138).
[695] Lucian, *De Salt.* 2.

terrible consequences for her family. Female lust, anger and jealousy are the core motives that drive the plots in Cnemon's tale—motives that also are located in *Hippolytus*, *Medea* and other Attic tragedies. But these motives can be found many other places in Greek literature, especially in literature that was meant for performance. The high tragic overtones that are found in the beginning of Cnemon's story could appear to be out of keeping with the 'domestic' and 'base' nature of the plots and schemes on which the story hinges. Attic tragedies never take place in everyday Athens and are characteristically focused on the high born and star-crossed. Cnemon's tale takes place at home, in his native Athens, with corresponding references to the Council of the Areopagus and other local Athenian institutions (1.9ff). Edith Hall notes that *Ion*'s Creusa 'is evidence of a newly intimate dramatic subjectivity'.[696] Although so much evidence is lost to us, Euripides' *Ion* does have much in common with Menander, which may suggest more domestication within later tragedy. In the *agon* of Aristophanes' *Frogs*, Aeschylus accuses Euripides of domesticating tragedy, bringing it too close to the banality of everyday life.[697] Although naturally Aristophanes indulges in unrestrained comic exaggeration, he still gives an idea of the direction that taste is heading. It is possible that Cnemon's story could in part reflect this trend.

Later comedy revolves around affairs in the daily home lives of less august members of society, not only in New Comedy but also in mime. The first genre that comes to mind when one thinks of domestic cares in Athens is New Comedy, which may have its place in influencing the novel genre in general. But the story told here has little in common with the father/son plots in New

[696] Hall (2007: 277).
[697] Aristophanes, *Frogs* 791ff.

Comedy, even though they did often revolve around a disagreement or misunderstanding between father and son. Oudot claims that New Comedy is a vehicle for a retelling of the Hippolytus story that represents Athenian social life,[698] a suggestion that fits well with Morgan's interpretation of Cnemon's story as a caricature of Athenian values and also shows how theatrical allusions are used to articulate themes in the novel.

Cnemon signposts his story's tragic affiliations, but it is left to a theatrically inclined reader to draw parallels with comic genres. Situating a tragic theme in a comic context recalls the genre of tragic burlesque. Another potential genre at play is mime, with its knack for skewering the foibles of city life. The sub-genre of adultery mime appears particularly recognisable. Twice in Cnemon's story do men burst into bedrooms expecting to confront adulterers. Both times law and order follow, at least in intention. Neither episode, however, follows the adultery mime plot to the letter. But one-to-one correspondence is not needed (nor should it be expected). Heliodorus does not replicate a mime on the page but rather uses mime elements and resonances, much in the same way that vase painters appear to have used tragedy and comedy.[699]

The 'adultery mime' appears to be one of the live performance contexts with which the novelists are in dialogue, and one that would be recognisable to a reader who participated in contemporary performance culture.[700] Heliodorus, perhaps with the traditions of Chariton and Achilles Tatius before him, finds yet another way to engage with the adultery theme. In *Callirhoe*, Chaereas rushes in expecting to find his wife with a lover, but instead assaults his faithful wife.

[698] Oudot (1992: 105), '*la représentation de la vie sociale d'Athènes, en fait, dans la mise en scène théâtrale de l'histoire nouvelle entre Phèdre, Hippolyte et Thésée, compliquée et travestie en Comédie Nouvelle'*.
[699] Taplin (2007).
[700] Schwartz (2010: 342).

Clitophon finds himself unwittingly caught in an adultery trap—'married' to a widow whose first husband is not dead, and who in turn falls in love with Leucippe, doubling the adultery threat. Heliodorus, in turn, takes the adultery theme and places it in an embedded narrative, divorcing it from any relation to the protagonists.[701] As in *Callirhoe*, the adultery scenes are 'staged' without actual adulterers, yet still have terrible consequences. As in Achilles Tatius, the adultery is 'doubled'—but in a way that neatly balances the two, with the victim of the second being the villain of the first. Whether the variations on the previous stories were intentional or no, they may have been apparent to a reader fond of novels. The awareness of adultery as a theme would increase the enjoyment of Cnemon's story, and make a reader alert to the manner in which Heliodorus treats that theme.

Another aspect that Cnemon's adultery tales share with the previous two novels is an overt theatricality and awareness of the mechanics of performance. For Morgan, the Athens portrayed in Cnemon's tale is a city of lust, in contrast to the pure and chaste love of the novel's Thessalian and Ethiopian protagonists.[702] It is also a city of false appearances—of actors and their naïve audiences. The story Cnemon tells hinges on the appearances—and performances—of its participants. Throughout the story, not only do characters play roles, they also arrange and coax their fellows into the playing of parts in the dramas they construct. Demainete and Thisbe are the architects of the two schemes, and are therefore the two who 'perform' most often. They are the direct equivalent of 'internalised playwrights' in metatheatre. Demainete and Thisbe fall closely in line with the 'clever slave' types of Roman Comedy, who create their own plots

[701] For the time being—the theme returns with the entrance or Arsake, discussed in the following chapter.
[702] Morgan (1989).

in which they play the protagonist, as well as appoint fellow actors. Cnemon and his father are pawns in both schemes, and both play unwitting roles as their actions and reactions are staged and prompted by Demainete and Thisbe.[703]

Demainete makes a show of love for her husband, well-versed as she is in the arts of seduction (τέχνην τὴν ἐπαγωγὸν ἐκτόπως ἠκριβωμένη, 1.9.2). She also ἐπλάττετο, 'pretended', to regard Cnemon as a son, kissing him and requesting his company (1.9.3). Her display of motherly affection conceals her true desires and intentions—to be near Cnemon, whom she wishes to seduce. When she calls him ὁ νέος Ἱππόλυτος, it is not only the reader who is alerted to a specific tragic allusion. It sends a message to Cnemon himself, who remarks, 'imagine how I felt since even now I blush in the telling' (τίνα με οἴεσθε γεγενῆσθαι ὅς καὶ νῦν ἐρυθριῶ διηγούμενος; 1.10.2). The mere mention of Hippolytus is enough for Cnemon to understand his stepmother's intentions. Knowledge of theatre and the ability to reference it can be used as a tool for communication. The basic dramatic plots could be considered an integral portion of the popular unconscious, so that a single hint is enough to conjure up an entire web of connotations. Indeed, even Cnemon's current blush at the mention of Hippolytus suggests that he still casts himself in that role, as a chaste and scandalised hero, and supports the characterisation of Cnemon as someone engaged in theatrical culture.

When Demainete's efforts at seduction are thwarted, she puts on another show—this time for her husband Aristippus, by lying in bed and 'recovering' from Cnemon's alleged assault. Bartsch argues that '*actio*' speaks louder than

[703] For comic undertones in Cnemon's tale see Paulsen (1992: 94-97), Crismani (1997: 105), Brethes (2007a: 115-24), Montiglio (2013: 150-151).

words in Heliodorus' descriptions of events,[704] and certainly the *actio* of convalescence serves to reinforce Demainete's spoken accusation against Cnemon,[705] but it is the combination of the two that gives the moment dramatic force. Cnemon creates a performance situation in the telling of the story. The first two instances of direct speech in Cnemon's story are Demainete's 'Hippolytus' comment and her speech of accusation against Cnemon, spoken to Aristippus. Although Heliodorus often goes to great pains to explain how a character has gained knowledge of an event they have not witnessed, Cnemon offers no reason for how he can recall exactly what Demainete said, when he was elsewhere in the house. It is a tiny inconsistency, but one that highlights Heliodorus' choice to use direct speech. There is little plausible reason for Cnemon to choose direct speech at this moment, besides to heighten the drama of his stepmother's lie, giving her a 'script' and a role to play. He constructs a dramatic scenario to flesh out the story he tells.

The next portion of direct speech, which may prompt a reader to recall the tense scene between Hippolytus and Theseus in *Hippolytus*, involves Cnemon asking his father why he is being beaten, to which his father replies, 'Oh the hypocrisy!... He wants me to explain his depravities to him!' (ὢ τῆς εἰρωνείας… τὰς πράξεις αὐτοῦ τὰς ἀνοσίας παρ᾽ ἐμοῦ βούλεται μανθάνειν, 1.11.2), before rushing back to his 'injured' wife. The scene, though brief, is animated through the dialogue and physical action—Cnemon is beaten by slaves at his father's orders, his father rushes off to tend to Demainete.[706] Cnemon also mentions that he is not given the opportunity to speak in his own defence. While Demainete is

[704] Bartsch (1989: 115ff).
[705] Haynes (2003: 110) remarks on the rhetorical skill of Demainete's speech.
[706] Euripides, *Hippolytus* 902ff. Theseus calls for servants to take Hippolytus away (1085); Aristippus orders servants to beat Cnemon. Paulsen (1992: 95).

able to wield her speech as a weapon, Cnemon is granted no corresponding shield. The power of speech and the according lack of power associated with being silent suggest that speech—persuasive speech—is a requirement for self-preservation and self-advancement. The ability to act goes hand in hand with speech, as Cnemon reports more direct speech from Demainete and Thisbe than from himself or his father, which adds to their characterisation as actors in a series of scenes. Correspondingly, the (re)actors, Aristippus and Cnemon, are offered fewer chances to speak, particularly Cnemon. Demainete and Thisbe retain control over their dramas by making themselves the protagonists. Their targets become mute characters.

Demainete then goes further with her deception by using Thisbe to manipulate the naïve Cnemon. The servant fools the young man into thinking her interest in his physical attractions is genuine (1.11.3). Again, direct speech is used for deception when Thisbe asks, 'what punishment would you say that woman [Demainete] deserves who claims to be well-born and has a lawfully wedded husband, and knowing death is the penalty for such an offense, commits adultery?' (τίνος ἂν ἐκείνην ἀξίαν εἴποις τιμωρίας, ἣ καὶ εὐγενὴς εἶναι φάσκουσα καὶ νόμῳ τὸν συνοικοῦντα ἔχουσα καὶ θάνατον τὸ τέλος τοῦ παρανομήματος γινώσκουσα μοιχᾶται, 1.11.4). Cnemon protests it can't be true, but Thisbe persists and promises that she 'will hand over the lover in the act' (ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ παραδώσω τὸν μοιχόν, 1.11.5). As discussed in chapter six, catching the lovers in the act is a climactic point in the adultery mime (and as we will discuss later, a crucial point of law discussed in legal cases real and fictitious). Thisbe sets the stage for a scene from adultery mime by convincing Cnemon to play the role of interrupting husband to preserve the honour of his father.

Not only does Thisbe set the stage, she also rehearses the actors. On the night the plan takes fruition, Thisbe instructs Cnemon

> πρὸς ἄμυναν εὐτρεπίζεσθαι καὶ ξιφήρη ποιεῖσθαι τὴν ἔφοδον τοῦ μὴ διαδρᾶναι τὸν ὑβριστήν
>
> to prepare myself for vengeance and burst in, blade in hand, so that the villain should not get away (1.12.1)

She effectively prepares him for his part to play in what turns out to be just a farce. There is no adulterer in the room, and instead he bursts in on his own father, shouting, sword in hand. To all appearances it looks as if he intends parricide. In his shock, he drops the sword and is swiftly apprehended. Cnemon, believing he was about to be presented with a scene of adultery, becomes instead the spectacle, caught red-handed at a crime he never meant to commit. Demainete caps Cnemon's actions with her words, saying to her husband,

> οὐ ταῦτα ἦν ἃ προηγόρευον…ὡς φυλάττεσθαι προσήκει τὸ μειράκιον, ὡς ἐπιβουλεύσει ἂν καιροῦ λαβόμενον; ἑώρων τὸ βλέμμα, συνίην τῆς διανοίας
>
> isn't this what I warned you about? I told you to beware of the boy, that he would attack you if he had the chance. I saw it in his eye, I knew his frame of mind. (1.12.4)

Her insinuations seal Cnemon's fate, and for the second time Cnemon is not allowed to defend himself in speech.

At Cnemon's murder trial, his father, 'showered his head in dirt' to arouse the pity of the jury (τῆς κεφαλῆς κόνιν καταχεάμενος, 1.13.1-2), speaks against his son, while Demainete weeps crocodile tears. Cnemon recounts:

> οὐ θρηνοῦσα μᾶλλον ἢ καταμαρτυροῦσα τοῖς θρήνοις καὶ ὡς ἀληθῆ τὴν κατηγορίαν βεβαιοῦσα τοῖς γόοις,
>
> she was not lamenting but rather testifying with her lamentations and confirming the truth of the accusation with weeping (1.13.3)

As a woman, Demainete cannot legally testify, but by making a public show of lamentation, she is able to wield as much influence as if she had taken the stand. Heliodorus leans on the stereotypical presentation of the 'female' as the consummate actress, and certainly female characters out-act and overpower male characters in Cnemon's tale.

Cnemon reports his reply when asked if he had drawn a sword on his father: 'I came upon him,' I said, 'but as for how, listen—' («ἐπῆλθον μὲν» εἰπόντος, «ἀλλ᾽ ὅπως, ἀκούσατε», 1.13.4). This causes an uproar that results in Cnemon being forbidden to speak in his own defence. Saundra Schwartz suggests that this episode may reflect a Hadrianic law that 'the admission of having drawn a sword is sufficient grounds for a conviction of attempted murder.'[707] It is also the third time that Cnemon is denied the opportunity of persuasive speech, and the previous two occasions have no legal precedent for explanation. There appears to be a symbolism beyond points of law. Cnemon is defenceless without speech. As the jury begin to cast their votes against him, 'Stepmother! I am being destroyed by my stepmother! My stepmother is destroying me without a trial!' (ὦ μητρυιά… διὰ μητρυιὰν ἀναιροῦμαι, μητρυιά με ἄκριτον ἀπόλλυσι, 1.13.5). These few words, a meagre defence, are enough to cast doubt on the proceedings and lead to a punishment of exile instead of death. The moment Cnemon is able to say anything himself, he improves his dire situation. The power of speech versus reality and the power of appearances versus reality both play large roles in this portion of Cnemon's narrative. Persuasive speech distorts reality, as do appearances. The combination of the two is particularly powerful—and particularly theatrical. The visual version of a

[707] *Dig*. 48.8.1.3; cf. Schwartz (2010: 342).

cuckold, wife and lover scene is the mime, as discussed above, but there is also a parallel for the situation as described in speech—in the set pieces of sophistic rhetoric. However, before I discuss these similarities further, I will turn to the second 'adultery scene' in the narrative.

While in exile, Cnemon encounters a contemporary from Athens, Charias, who embraces him and announces that Demainete is dead (1.14.3). For Cnemon, that is not news enough. He pleads,

> Εἰπὲ καὶ τὸν τρόπον, ὡς σφόδρα δέδοικα μὴ τῷ κοινῷ κέχρηται θανάτῳ καὶ διέδρα τὸν πρὸς ἀξίαν,
>
> Tell me the way [in which she died], for I am very much afraid that she may have died some commonplace death and escaped the one she deserved. (1.14.4)

Again, a story is asked for in full, as a means of consolation. This sort of exchange of information, with one person offering a short version of a story and his audience requesting a more detailed account, often occurs in the *Aethiopica*. Storytellers are urged to tell their story at length, even in this story within the story. Chariklea and Theagenes urge Cnemon to speak, Cnemon urges on his friend and later in the narrative encourages Calasiris.

Charias' narrative contains a great deal of direct speech, including monologues by Demainete along with dialogues between Demainete and Thisbe, and Thisbe and Aristippus. Before he begins, Charias explains that his intimacy with Thisbe has given him access to the entire story—giving the reader a plausible explanation for how Charias, not an eye-witness, is able to deliver the tale with so much inside knowledge. This also gives the impression of yet another layer of narrative voice in the story—Cnemon quoting Charias quoting Thisbe. The episode contains layers of narrative voices and direct speech found in works like Plato's *Symposium* and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.

Thisbe, as mentioned in the summary above, fears for herself when her mistress, longing for Cnemon and regretting her past actions, begins to blame Thisbe for her part in the scheme. The slave decides to turn on her mistress, using a plan similar to the one Demainete had devised for Thisbe to use against Cnemon—another adultery plot. The (false) plan she describes to Demainete involves role-playing and deception—within Thisbe's own deception. Thisbe claims Cnemon has a lover named Arsinoe. She makes her mistress offers to pretend to be in love with Cnemon and to ask Arsinoe to allow Thisbe to spend the night with him in Arsinoe's place. Thisbe, in turn, will allow Demainete to take her place, so that finally her mistress can be with her stepson (1.15.7). Where previously Thisbe had urged Cnemon to prepare himself for violence, here the servant encourages her mistress to pretend to be Arsinoe the flute girl. Twice, Thisbe prepares people for roles in an adultery mime—the outraged interrupter and the adulterous wife. In this plot, as before, Demainete must put on a performance, but this time the expert manipulator is expertly manipulated.[708]

Thisbe, in order to achieve her aims, must present three different (false) scenarios to three different people and persuade them to act accordingly. After convincing Demainete, she must arrange with Arsinoe, which she does through another brief dialogue, with direct speech from Thisbe alone, asking to borrow a room in her establishment in order to sleep with a mutual acquaintance (1.16.1). Every portion of the plot is laid out step by step, with no glossing over of details. The intricacy of the scheme becomes apparent as each of Thisbe's actions adds a layer of false perceptions. No extant theatrical plot presents this intricate a layering of deception plots, not even Roman Comedy. It would seem that

[708] As Michael Trapp has pointed out to me, Thisbe's own scheme to convince her mistress to pretend to be someone else adds a satisfying irony to her own death—an accident of mistaken identity.

Heliodorus, like Achilles Tatius, creates in prose a situation that outdoes similar ones from the theatre.

Although the reader knows that Thisbe is plotting against her mistress, the way in which she plans to do so only becomes clear to the reader when Thisbe speaks to the third person she must fool, Aristippus. She says,

> ἥκω σοι κατήγορος ἐμαυτῆς καὶ κέχρησο ὅ τι βούλει. Τὸν παῖδα δι᾽ ἐμὲ τὸ μέρος ἀπολώλεκας οὐκ ἑκοῦσαν μὲν ἀλλ᾽ ὅμως συναιτίαν γενομένην. αἰσθομένη γὰρ τὴν δέσποιναν οὐκ ὀρθῶς βιοῦσαν ἀλλ᾽ εὐνὴν τὴν σὴν ἐνυβρίζουσαν… φράζω δὲ τῷ νέῳ δεσπότῃ νύκτωρ παρ᾽ αὐτὸν ἐλθοῦσα, ὡς ἂν γνοίη μηδείς, καὶ ἔλεγον ὡς μοιχὸς ἅμα τῇ δεσποίνῃ συγκαθεύδοι…ὀργῆς ἀκατασχέτου πληρωθείς, ἀνελόμενος τὸ ἐγχειρίδιον, ἐμοῦ κατέχειν πειρωμένης… καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ γινώσκεις.
>
> I have come to make a confession to you. Do to me what you will. It is partly my fault that you have lost your son. I did not mean it to happen, but nevertheless I share the blame. For I discovered my mistress's conduct was not appropriate, that she was dishonouring your bed... I went to the young master at night, so that no one should know, and told him that an adulterer was sleeping with my mistress... he was filled with uncontrollable anger, taking up his dagger while I attempted to restrain him... You know the rest. (1.16.2-3)

Thisbe, fitting her lies around the truth, offers a plausible explanation for Cnemon's behaviour and reshapes her own.[709] Instead of encouraging Cnemon's rage, in this version she attempts to hold him back. In a sense, Thisbe is almost an 'Aristotelian' playwright in her attempt to create a plausible set of characters. Her performance and her explanation are convincing. Aristippus agrees to follow Thisbe and catch his wife in the act, and the reader realises that Thisbe is sending Aristippus after the same phantom lover she used to snare Cnemon.

Cnemon/Charias never states Thisbe's intentions or goals during the plot. It is left to the reader (and the listening Theagenes and Chariclea) to speculate the reasons for her actions and the subtext of her speeches. As in the greater

[709] Haynes (2003: 129) comments on Thisbe's cleverness and ability to plan ahead.

narrative of the novel, the narrator provides more description than interpretation, which gives the reader an 'eye-witness' experience that involves processing 'visual' and 'aural' information in much the same way a spectator must process a performance. Charias/Cnemon describes every ensuing step, from when and where Aristippus is to meet Thisbe, to how Thisbe leaves Demainete in the bed—removing the lamp to avoid 'Cnemon' recognising Demainete. She then goes to fetch 'Cnemon', but instead goes to meet her husband, and 'urged him to catch the lover in the act and arrest him' (δεσμεῖν ἐπιστάντα τὸν μοιχὸν ἤπειγεν, 1.17.3). Aristippus bursts into the room and exclaims, 'I have you, wretch, by the gods!' (ἔχω σε… ὦ θεοῖς ἐχθρά, 1.17.3). At that instant, Thisbe slams the doors as hard as she can and calls out, 'Bad luck! Her lover escaped! Look out, master, lest you make a mistake a second time too (ὦ τῆς ἀτοπίας, διαδέδρακεν ἡμᾶς ὁ μοιχός… ὅρα, δέσποτα, μὴ καὶ τὰ δεύτερα σφαλῇς, 1.17.4). The dimming of the lamp keeps Aristippus from truly 'seeing' anything, but Thisbe uses sound and the power of suggestion to convince him the phantom lover is real. The sound effects and premeditated 'staging' of the room show Thisbe to be in complete control of how to stage a performance, along with the ability to perform. The use of the door as a prop recalls the stage. House doors are prominent set pieces in Greek and Roman comedy, and sudden exits accompanied by loud noises are attributed to mime.[710]

Thisbe's urgent exhortations echo her encouraging words to Cnemon, and Aristippus, like his son, finds himself primed to participate in an adultery farce, even as he accepts every stage effect as part of real life. Demainete, on the other hand, is no novice performer. Too late she recognises the deceit for what it is—

[710] Cicero, *Pro Cael.* 65. Webb (2013: 293) also points out the detail of slamming doors.

’grieving at the way she’d been trapped, furious at the way she had been tricked’ (ἀνιωμένη μὲν ἐφ᾽ οἷς ἡλίσκετο χαλεπαίνουσα δὲ ἐφ᾽ οἷς ἠπάτητο, 1.17.5). The use of the verb ἀπατάω/ἀπατᾶσθαι suggests a theatrical connotation, as discussed earlier.[711] A fragment from the fifth or fourth century BCE sophist Gorgias connects ἀπάτη with dramatic illusion.

> ὅ τ᾽ ἀπατήσας δικαιότερος τοῦ μὴ ἀπατήσαντος καὶ ὁ ἀπατηθεὶς σοφώτερος τοῦ μὴ ἀπατηθέντος
>
> The one who deceives is more just than the one who does not deceive, and the one who is deceived is wiser than the one who is not deceived.[712]

An educated reader would have understood that Demainete, clever as she was, had been taken in by the illusion-making power of Thisbe’s ‘play’. Being acquainted with the mechanics of performance makes it easier to discern the performances of others. It certainly helps, in this case, that Demainete is well acquainted with the formula for a false adultery scene. Knowing that only ruin lies ahead, as Aristippus drags her towards the city, Demainete leaps into the pit in the Akademia, ‘head first’ (ἐπὶ κεφαλήν, 1.17.5). The addition of the detail ἐπὶ κεφαλήν turns this climactic conclusion into a vivid spectacle.

The detail and step-by-step depiction of the plot against Demainete make it a balanced counterpart to the plot against Cnemon. Not only do both traps play on the idea of catching an adulterer in the act, they both involve Demainete as the ‘adulteress’—the one crime of which she is innocent, even though she does not wish to be. Both adultery plots make use of the mechanisms of theatre on multiple levels. The idea of the entire tale as a performance begins with Cnemon’s quotation of and allusion to tragedy. It is continued in the way the tale

[711] See chapter five.
[712] Gorgias, B23 D-K.

is related—through description and direct speech, almost like dialogue and stage direction. The experience for the reader is like that of a spectator. Performance is also found within the machinations within the story. Demainete and Thisbe must 'perform' certain roles in order for the plots to be successful. And not only do they need to perform, but they must convince others to play roles in their own drama. A parallel could be found with the playlets that Euripides and his Kinsman attempt to stage in *Thesmophoriazousae*. The pair wish to use a performance to escape, but their deception will not work unless they force roles upon bystanders and these roles are accepted. Neither Critylla nor the Scythian accept their roles, so the deception fails. Heliodorus instead makes his characters play along; when Cnemon could use speech to refuse his role, he is conveniently silenced.

On top of this, there is the engagement with a popular performance genre, mime, in the structure of both adultery plots. The adultery plot, with a phantom adulterer, is similar to the scheme the Acragantine suitor devises against Chaereas in Chariton's Callirhoe. The 'adultery theme' in extant Greek novels is never straightforward, and rarely involves any actual adultery. For those reasons, it is hard to suggest that the influence is pure litigiousness,[713] with an emphasis on Lysias 1. It is unlikely the Lysias speech was the sole influence for the adultery scenes in the novels, though it is possible that Lysias' depiction of adultery relies on similar theatrical subject matter. He may have been playing off the already familiar *moechus* stereotype from comedy, which is also found in later mime, as discussed in the previous chapter.[714] The dangers of searching for a single specific influence aside, the sensations created, both in the 'staging' of

[713] As argued by Kapparis (2000) and questioned by Porter (2003). Schwartz (2000-2001) and (2010) focuses mostly on the similarities to litigation.
[714] Porter (1997: 422-423).

the ‘adultery’ and in the ‘adultery’ trials, is what drives the novel and makes readers read on—the drama of it. That drama comes from a sense of performance, informed by the performance culture in which the readers lived and breathed.

Estelle Oudot suggests that Cnemon’s theatricalisation of Athens corresponds with the image of Cnemon himself, ‘*qui devient l’homme du théâtre*’, an actor who travels Egypt playing the *rôle* of ‘*Hippolyte dégradé*’.[715] Oudot focuses on his response to discovering Thisbe dead in a cave in Egypt, and his eagerness to be entertained by Calasiris’ own story about Theagenes and Charicleia. Her observations can be expanded upon to show in greater detail the way in which Heliodorus continues to give Cnemon’s tale a theatrical bent, and how his depiction of the character of Cnemon appears to be contrived to accentuate these effects. I will first discuss the continued theatricalisation of Cnemon’s story, and will return to the character of Cnemon in the discussion of rhetoric.

When Chariclea learns that Cnemon and Theagenes have discovered the dead body of Thisbe, ‘How can it be that [she] was sent forth out of the heart of Greece to the remotest parts of Egypt, as if by means of the *mechâne*?’ (πῶς ἦν εἰκός… τὴν ἐκ μέσης τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἐπ᾽ ἐσχάτοις γῆς Αἰγύπτου καθάπερ ἐκ μηχανῆς ἀναπεμφῆναι; 2.8.3). As mentioned in a previous chapter, this allusion to stagecraft is a metaphor for the guiding hand of the author, an oblique tribute to the novelist as a dramatist of sorts. It is also, more literally, a reference to the way that Cnemon’s Athenian drama has been transplanted to Egypt. Cnemon’s tale, which was so full of stage effects, is extended through the ‘metaphorical’

[715] Oudot (1992: 105).

use of another. Her appearance gives Cnemon the opportunity to finish his story and explain his father's exile and Thisbe's flight (2.8-10).

Where Cnemon's story ends, the tablet on Thisbe's body picks up, explaining that she has been captured by bandits, hence her appearance in the cave (2.10). Cnemon reacts to her written story with a speech of his own, delivered to her corpse,

> σὺ μὲν καλῶς ποιοῦσα τέθνηκας καὶ γέγονας ἡμῖν αὐτάγγελος τῶν ἑαυτῆς συμφορῶν ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐγχειρίσασα τῶν σῶν σφαγῶν τὴν διήγησιν. Οὕτως ἄρα τιμωρὸς Ἐρινὺς γῆν ἐπὶ πᾶσαν, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἐλαύνουσά σε οὐ πρότερον ἔστησε τὴν ἔνδικον μάστιγα πρὶν καὶ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ με τυγχάνοντα τὸν ἠδικημένον θεατὴν ἐπιστῆσαι τῆς κατὰ σοῦ ποινῆς. … Ὡς κἀγώ σε καὶ κειμένην ἔχω δι᾽ ὑποψίας καὶ σφόδρα δέδοικα μὴ καὶ πλάσμα ἐστιν ἡ Δημαινέτης τελευτὴ κἀμὲ μὲν ἠπάτησαν οἱ ἐξαγγείλαντες σὺ δὲ καὶ διαπόντιος ἥκεις ἑτέραν καθ᾽ ἡμῶν σκηνὴν Ἀττικὴν καὶ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ τραγῳδήσουσα.
>
> It is a good thing that you are dead and that you were yourself the messenger of your misfortunes,[716] for it was your very corpse that delivered your narrative into our hands! It is like an avenging Fury drove you over all the world and did not stop her whip of justice until you came into Egypt, where I happened to be, and presented me with the just spectacle of retribution from you… Even dead I hold you in suspicion, and I very much fear that the story of Demainete's death is untrue, that the friends who brought me the news were deceiving me, and that you have come across the sea to play another Attic tragedy against me, but in an Egyptian setting! (2.11.1-2)

Cnemon's speech has some overtones of Attic tragedy—but there is no real 'tragedy' in what he relates. He did not recognise a mime plot where it existed, but he sees a tragic plot where there is not. He describes Thisbe as a 'messenger', perhaps a nod to the tragic convention, but it is her dead body that bears the message, replacing the messenger's description of a death with the dead body itself. In addition, he claims that a 'Fury' has chased Thisbe to Egypt, as if she were a persecuted Orestes or Io, but the audience is aware that she came to Egypt

[716] The idea of a messenger bringing news of his (or her) own misfortune has a tragic pedigree: Menelaus' messenger disguise in Euripides' *Helen* 1205-1290 allows him to announce his own shipwreck (and, in that case, false death).

as the mistress of the wealthy Nausikles—which is not exactly hardship. Her death by bandits is described as 'a spectacle of retribution' for Cnemon's benefit. The show that is presented for him is not particularly 'tragic', nor do I think it is meant to be. It is a show, and her appearance a stunning *coup de théâtre*, but Cnemon's conception of events is exaggerated to the point of melodrama. He begins to fear that he has, once again, been deceived, and it is this that produces the slightly hysterical announcement that he is to be the victim of an Attic tragedy in an Egyptian setting.

It is possible that Cnemon's speech, and the context, contain allusions that are lost to us. It is impossible to identify what sort of tragic excerpts *tragoidoi* were performing at the time—if there were a trend towards the type we would today label 'melodramatic', perhaps Cnemon's point of reference is in part related to a form of tragedy. His situation as a well-born Greek in a foreign land resembles elements of Euripides *Iphigenia in Tauris*. The popularity of the *IT* story in the Imperial period suggests that adventure and escape narratives suited the tastes of the times. It is important to note, however, that elements of the plot of the *IT* seem to have reached audiences through a variety of texts and performances, not simply through the text of the Euripidean tragic version.[717] The *Charition* mime from P.Oxy 413 is the single extant tragic burlesque from this period, but gives a tantalising taste of the ways tragic themes could be perpetuated and subverted. The mime script's bathetic humour in combination with the high-flown language of its female protagonist makes a useful analogue for understanding how Cnemon's speech can be at once 'tragic' and 'mimic'. As with so many instances in the Greek novels (and Greek literature in general),

[717] Hall (2013a: 134-162, esp. 136-39).

Cnemon's situation has more than one potential resonance. The reader's experience can be enriched by the recognition of these resonances.

It does not serve to interpret the *Aethiopica*'s theatrical allusions only through the lens of tragedy, and to note an error in Heliodorus when tragic allusion and narrative situation do not perfectly correspond. Heliodorus appears to poke fun at Cnemon for a similar mode of thinking. The Athenian appears ridiculous when he attempts to shoehorn the events of Thisbe's appearance into the tragic genre. They may not fit. The baselessness of Cnemon's fears and the silliness of Cnemon's attempt to make his story 'tragic', when Theagenes disavows any role in Cnemon's 'tragedy' (2.11.3), suggesting that it is purely of Cnemon's own making.[718] His emphasis on the supernatural and magical takes the tone further away from Attic tragedy, as he implicitly accuses Cnemon of having more superstition than sense. However, his mention of δρᾶμα gives support within the text for Cnemon's theatrical sensibilities. In some ways, perhaps Cnemon shares some characteristics of Gorgias' wiser spectator, who is taken in by the ἀπάτη of the theatre. However, his ability to be deceived extends beyond the stage, leaving him with less wisdom.

Athens or Sophistopolis?

Cnemon's story almost seems as if it could have occurred in Donald Russell's imaginary city 'Sophistopolis', the city where the complicated hypothetical legal cases expounded by sophists come to life.[719] In Sophistopolis, court proceedings ensue over accusations of murder, direct and indirect, but that is just the tip of the iceberg. Even domestic dramas such as adultery accusations

[718] See chapter two.
[719] Russell (1983: 22). For further on rhetoric in general see Goldhill (1995), Berry and Heath (1997).

and quarrels between fathers and sons become the stuff of legal procedure.[720] Convoluted situations and legal circumstances were argued and expounded as public performances, through declamation. Cases from declamation resonate with the episodes in Cnemon's tale, in stock themes possibly more than any particular reference to any particular declamation on a theme. Also, declamations were staged performances in themselves. As Philostratus' *Lives of Sophists* shows, declaimers chose to present themselves in calculated manners—from cultivating exceedingly flamboyant to exceedingly simple attire—to create a recognisable character that would captivate an audience.[721] Choricius, for example, compares declamation to the stage.[722]

The general similarity to the situations described in declamation sits well with the location of Cnemon's story.[723] The setting of Athens, the centre of rhetorical education, further highlights the way that both adultery plots lead to litigation. The depiction of Athens in the Greek novel has been discussed by others,[724] especially by Steven Smith in reference to *Callirhoe*, in which the bandit Theron chooses not to anchor his ship in Athens. Theron explains,

> μόνοι γὰρ ὑμεῖς οὐκ ἀκούετε τὴν πολυπραγμοσύνην τῶν Ἀθηναίων; δῆμος ἐστι λάλος καὶ φιλόδικος, ἐν δὲ τῷ λιμένι μυρίοι συκοφάνται πεύσονται τίνες ἐσμὲν καὶ πόθεν ταῦτα φέρομεν τὰ φορτία. ὑποψία καταλήψεται πονηρὰ τοὺς κακοήθεις. Ἄρειος πάγος εὐθὺς ἐκεῖ καὶ ἄρχοντες τυράννων βαρύτεροι.
>
> are you the only people who haven't heard about the nosiness of the Athenians? They are a clan of gossips and love lawsuits. There will be a myriad busybodies in the harbour who will learn who we are and where we got this cargo we carry. Nasty suspicions will seize hold of their malicious minds. Then it's the Areopagus straightaway and magistrates crueller than tyrants. (1.11.6-7)

[720] Russell (1983: 22ff), Kennedy (2003), as well as chapter one.
[721] For example, Philostratus' descriptions of Alexander Peloplaton (*VS* 572) and Adrian of Tyre (*VS* 587).
[722] Choricius, *Dialexis* 12, p. 248 F.-R. Russell (1983: 82). See also Hall (2013b).
[723] Hock (1997) and Webb (2007) both treat rhetoric in the novel.
[724] Oudot (1992) and Smith (2007).

The way that the city is portrayed in Cnemon's tale suggests that little has changed in the novels' depiction of Athens from Chariton to Heliodorus. His story includes two completed lawsuits and one intended lawsuit—all for different reasons: attempted murder (worse, a parricide), accessory to a suicide, and adultery.

Russell's fictional Sophistopolis abounds with cases in which someone has died or committed suicide, and another person is put on trial for causing the circumstance that led to the death.[725] The way Demainete's family pursues legal action against Aristippus, leading to his exile, fits within this declamatory context. Cnemon's murder case is slightly more straightforward, at least in outward appearance—a son caught with a sword in hand, ready to murder his father—but the elaborate plot set in place to create the damning spectacle seems to suit Sophistopolis. In the case of false accusations on adultery, Russell describes a situation in which a husband schedules a romantic assignation with his wife under an assumed name, then divorces her for adultery when she keeps the appointment. In Heliodorus, the adultery trap is used twice—and in this case, the husband uses the same trick again to divorce his next wife.[726]

In addition to these examples from a range of authors throughout the Greek-speaking world in the Imperial period, there are similarities in Cnemon's tale to be found in Classical Attic oratory. Oudot suggests that Aristippus' speech against Cnemon is similar to the kinds of argument used by sophists, particularly Lysias 4 and 15.[727] Aristippus does sound slightly Lysianic in his description of his completion of all his fatherly duties, which were repaid with violence (1.13.1-

[725] Choricius *Or*. 35, *RG* IV.142, *RG* VIII.182; Russell (1983: 26, 39).
[726] Liban. *Decl*. 4o, *RG* VIII.229; Miniucianus 350 sp.-H; Russell (1983: 34, 59).
[727] Oudot (1992: 104), the speech '*semble parodier l'argumentation type présentée par les logographes*'.

2). The enormous jury, which votes for his conviction and his punishment, also appears to recall, if not precisely imitate, Athenian legal procedure.[728] The proceedings are a recognisably 'Athenian' spectacle. Many second sophistic declamation themes appear to have been set in a vaguely Classical past, some even using points of Attic law as their basis.[729] The law under which Cnemon is prosecuted resembles one regarding the mistreatment of parents, as described by Demosthenes.[730] Schwartz notes that the legal procedure in Heliodorus does not completely conform to Athenian conventions, and also notes that the author uses the post-classical προαγγέλλειν instead of the Athenian (and Demosthenian) law term εἰσαγγέλλειν.[731] For Schwartz, the change in terms is a choice on Heliodorus' part to relate to his contemporary readers and recall the words of Demosthenes. While this is possible, it is equally likely that Heliodorus borrowed his terms and law court conventions from later sophistic declaimers, for whom Demosthenes was a model. It is as if Heliodorus is presenting a declaimer's version of 'classical Athens' as characterised by declamatory themes from the second sophistic.

The influence of rhetoric can also be found in the structure of Cnemon's story, particularly within the portrayal of Cnemon himself. The creation of an *ethos*, or character, served a practical purpose in Attic oratory, when professional speech writers like Lysias would craft speeches to be delivered by others. In the second sophistic, *ethos* is an essential part of declamation, when an orator delivered a speech in the persona of someone else, either a historical or fictional

[728] Oudot (1992: 105). Russell (1983: 23 n 11) mentions that the jury split recalls a declamation case about what constitutes a majority, for instance Liban. *Decl*. 45, cf, *Decl*. 46; Quint. *Decl*. *min*. 365, *RLM* 97.15-19, Gellius 9.15.7.
[729] Russell (1983: 22-23, 33, 106).
[730] Demosthenes, *Against Timocles* 24.105; Schwartz (2010: 340-341).
[731] Schwartz (2010: 341-342).

personage.[732] Such creation of a distinct character required imaginative skill, and for declaimers, the ability to act, to play a convincing role. Heliodorus gives Cnemon a distinct personality through the character's speech. By what Cnemon says, not by what the narrator tells them, the reader learns that the young man is Athenian, that he is acquainted with Attic tragedy, and that he tends to use the language of theatre to describe the events in his life. Cnemon paints himself as rather naïve through the description of his surprise and pleasure in succeeding in attracting Thisbe and through the way that she and Demainete so easily entrap him (1.11.3). Through his characterisations, Cnemon takes on the role of declaimer himself. He portrays the personalities of the other characters in his narrative, even using direct speech to give them distinct voices. He impersonates the voice of his father, in Aristippus' court speech, presents the voice of Charias and delivers a speech by Thisbe. Calasiris will later also give voice to characters within his own story, and Chariclea will also play the declaimer when she gives public speeches.

Conclusion

The introduction of Cnemon prepares the reader for a theatrical experience, just as the opening prepares the reader for a visual one. Cnemon's quotation of tragedy lays the ground for his theatrical outlook on life and preoccupation with tragedy. Demainete's use of the name Hippolytus cues Cnemon, his internal audience and the reader to the predicament in which he has found himself. This reference shows how a single theatrical term can speak volumes. Cnemon expects his listeners (and Heliodorus expects his readers) to

[732] See introduction and chapter one. Russell (1983: 1-20, 106-128), Hock (1997: 455), Anderson (2003: 55-64), Whitmarsh (2005: 20).

understand the allusion. It is a straightforward reference, an 'entry-level' allusion that alerts the reader to be on the lookout for further dramatic parallels. Cnemon is the first character to describe events in his life as parts of a performance, but he is not the last one to do so. As mentioned earlier, Chariclea speaks of the theatrical *mêchâne* as a plot device in their lives, and Charicles refers to events in his own life in tragic terms. Theatre is not confined to Cnemon's own perceptions, though those perceptions amplify the parallels between his story and theatrical performance. The reader encounters Cnemon shortly after the opening scene, which plays on the mechanics of audience and performer. Cnemon's story offers another view of performance conditions, cued by his own references to tragedy. His tale is one in which every element of stagecraft is recounted, and includes deliberate scripted performances. He shows us how a story can be told without *aporia* but with just as much emphasis on visual and aural information, and that contrast in information and specificity feeds the reader's desire to discover Chariclea and Theagenes' story in equally vivid terms.

The two schemes in Cnemon's narrative *do* recall performance genres other than tragedy, despite Cnemon's own emphasis. His Athenian heritage gives him an association with tragedy, but also with sophistic performance and legal proceedings. His situation recalls the complicated situations found in Imperial declamation, which in turn hark back to earlier orators and rhetoricians like Demosthenes and Lysias. Cnemon's situation and his trial do not strictly follow any single extant speech, but rather resemble aspects of the genre. Similarities to declamation are found later in the novel, and again it is Cnemon who provides the first instance. He also gives the first example of elements of mime—from physical elements like slamming doors to plot resemblances to adultery mimes.

As with declamation, it is reductive to expect one-to-one correlation between a single mime and Cnemon's experiences, especially when the author draws from a variety of genres. It is this variety of genres and wealth of potential recognitions on the part of the reader that make Cnemon's story richer and more enjoyable.

8. Further Subliterary Interference

Introduction

In chapter five I discussed two episodes in which a popular mime genre appears to influence episodes in Chariton and Achilles Tatius. In chapter six, we saw how the same mime genre seems to influence Cnemon's tale in Heliodorus. This chapter contains further examples of how other aspects of subliterary genres can infiltrate the novels without being the sole, or even primary, object of reference or allusion. A reading that includes mime, pantomime and other genres helps to add texture and depth to the narratives. Moments in the three novels appear to bear the traces of subliterary influences—even if sometimes these are difficult to discern with, as it were, the naked eye. The first of these examples regards the existence and fate of a peripheral character in Chariton, Theron, and how he takes on additional interest and colour when viewed in conjunction with the *Laureolus* mime.

Turning to Achilles Tatius and a papyrus fragment that has provoked debate regarding the novel's relationship with mime, I propose a new approach to exploring potential intersections between Achilles Tatius and subliterary performance. Achilles Tatius also offers two opportunities to discuss potential pantomime interference, in Clinias' possible familiarity with the genre and Clitophon's manner of telling the Tereus/Philomela myth. In both, pantomime may not be the sole source or influence, but it is an important genre to investigate, especially considering its popularity in antiquity. The chapter concludes with Theagenes and Chariclea's adventures in Memphis, which relate to subliterary themes. Heliodorus complicates the theatricality of his narrative when his characters discuss questions regarding the morality of putting on a

performance. Subliterary performance works in combination with a variety of other influences to create a rich language that runs through these episodes. Identifying it enriches the reading experience.

Theron and the *Laureolus* mime

I have already argued that elements of mime can be read in the suitors' plot that leads to Callirhoe's apparent death. It is also possible to read mime influences in a character introduced after this event. Chariton follows the ekphrasis of Callirhoe's lavish funeral with the introduction of Theron, a bandit. He describes the character's profession as a pirate and records his internal monologue leading to the decision to rob Callirhoe's tomb, his deliberation over recruiting a gang and his agonistic debate with the gang members over what to do with Callirhoe (1.7-11). The Theron episode is remarkably detailed and represents one of the first shifts of focus away from the protagonists.[733] He receives a significant amount of narrative attention for a character that will be killed less than halfway through the story.[734] He delivers several speeches, and participates in dialogue with an anonymous few of his robber band. When Chaereas and his fellow Syracusans capture Theron at sea, he is again given the opportunity to speak, first inventing a fiction about himself, and finally confessing the truth under torture during his public trial in the Syracusan θέατρον. After his confession, Theron is crucified in front of Callirhoe's tomb.

Bandits are a feature in all the 'ideal' Greek novels, as they were for travellers in the ancient world. Robbery and piracy were genuine dangers, and

[733] The first two, however, are closely related to the lovers from their beginnings (the city council that initiates their wedding and the suitors' plot), while the shift of focus onto Theron, a character of a completely social sphere, with no relationship with the protagonists, is more jarring.
[734] He is executed in the third book, but he is distinctive even in death—he is the only named character who dies in the novel.

outlaws surely held a place in cultural consciousness.[735] P.A. MacKay suggests that tales of bandits are closely related to songs, such as modern folk songs that celebrate the life and deeds of an outlaw.[736] His willingness to consider a subliterary origin or intersection is intriguing, though he admits 'there is no possibility of a serious investigation of the source for these tales in antiquity.'[737] Although I agree it is dangerous to pinpoint a specific origin, I do believe it is reasonable to consider the existence of a subliterary tradition revolving around bandit tales, sung or otherwise. Though there is no extant ancient parallel for musical performances about bandits, at least one specific outlaw appears to have been the subject of several mimic productions. A mime called *Laureolus,* written by the mimographer Valerius Catullus, was performed in CE 41, which, if we accept the argument that Chariton's novel can be dated to the 50s CE, places this specific mime and any prior versions or subsequent imitations within the chronological scope of influence for Chariton and his audience.

Hermann Reich offers an elaborate reconstruction of this *Laureolus* mime, in which an enslaved Laureolus runs away from his master's house, joins a robber gang, becomes their leader and commits various acts of banditry. Eventually he is caught and the mime concludes with his trial and crucifixion.[738] Reich's imaginative reconstruction has little basis in extant material and represents his own interpretation of what could have constituted a mime plot. Although I will not venture a rival and inevitably equally speculative reconstruction, I do believe it is possible to speculate about certain characters and

[735] For additional information on bandits in the ancient world and the novels, see MacKay (1963), MacMullen (1966), Winkler (1980), Shaw (1984), Hooff (1988), Hopwood (1998), de Souza (1999). A formulaic inscription found in funeral epigraphs was 'killed by bandits' (*interfectus a latronibus*), MacMullen (1966: 257-259).
[736] MacKay (1963: 152).
[737] MacKay (1963: 152).
[738] Reich (1903: 88-89).

components that could have belonged in the performance, based on the evidence we do have. Naturally, the mime showcased the eponymous Laureolus character. It is also reasonable to assume that other actors may have represented members of a bandit gang (as references to bandits are usually in the plural, it seems possible Laureolus would not have worked alone). Since Laureolus is punished, it seems likely that actors also impersonated representatives of the imperial justice system. Laureolus' punishment also suggests that his crimes were at least discussed if not enacted on the stage.

Stage violence is attested for the *Laureolus* mime. Suetonius mentions:

> *cum in Laureolo mimo, in quo a[u]ctor proripiens se ruina sanguinem uomit, plures secundarum certatim experimentum artis darent, cruore scaena abundauit.*
>
> …in a mime called *Laureolus*, in which the chief actor falls as he is making his escape and vomits blood, several understudies eagerly gave proof in the skill. The stage overflowed with blood. (*Gaius/Calig.* 57.4)

This bloody episode in *Laureolus* does not appear to refer to the scene in which the main character is executed, but rather seems to reference an earlier episode in the mime.[739] It would seem versions of *Laureolus* could contain multiple violent scenes, though most ancient accounts focus on what was likely the production's crowning scene: the bandit's death. In some versions, the condemned bandit perishes in a more typical execution style— crucifixion. Juvenal writes,

> *Laureolum uelox etiam bene Lentulus egit,*
>
> *iudice me dignus uera cruce.*
>
> The nimble Lentulus acted the part of Laureolus well,
>
> deserving, in my judgment, to be truly crucified.[740]

[739] Kehoe (1984: 99).
[740] Juvenal, *Sat. 8*, 187-88.

Martial mentions another production of *Laureolus*, performed in an amphitheater, in which the bandit is mauled to death by a bear.[741]

Whatever the manner of Laureolus' death, it made enough of an impression that the performances are mentioned by Martial and Juvenal, with a likelihood that a reader would understand the references. The live mauling of the Laureolus actor reflects the conflation of legal punishment and entertainment most memorably chronicled by Katherine Coleman. Condemned criminals (and Christians) could be forced to reenact violent deaths from myth and drama as punishment for their crimes.[742] The *Laureolus* mime reflects the popularity of the crime and punishment motif. The mime could be enacted with fake blood, or in earnest, with a genuine punishment. Violence and punishment also made for a compelling spectacle without any theatrical dressing, such as gladiatorial combat and straightforward public executions.[743]

The violence, crime, and punishment of *Laureolus* resonate with the action in Chariton. Theron is tortured while on trial in the theatre at Syracuse. Chariton, unlike Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus, rarely lingers over violence in his narrative.[744] However, he is unusually specific in his depiction of Theron's torture. He writes,

> Βασανιστὰς εὐθὺς ἐκάλουν καὶ μάστιγες προσεφέροντο τῷ δυσσεβεῖ· καιόμενος δὲ καὶ τεμνόμενος ἀντεῖχεν ἐπὶ πλέον καὶ μικροῦ δεῖν ἐνίκησε τὰς βασάνους. ἀλλὰ μέγα τὸ συνειδὸς ἑκάστῳ καὶ παγκρατὴς ἡ ἀλήθεια

[741] Martial *Lib. Spect.* 7, cf. Coleman (1990: 64-65).
[742] Coleman (1990: 44-73), Potter (1993: esp. 53-67).
[743] Potter (1993), Bowersock (1995), Plass (1995), Halporn (1996).
[744] While Achilles Tatius lingers over Leucippe's *Scheintode* and Heliodorus provides a grisly opening scene complete with half-dead, twitching bodies, Chariton usually glosses over violence. For example, though Chaereas calls for fire and whips (1.5.1) when he interrogates his servants, there is only that hint of violence, no description of the interrogations themselves.

> Straightaway they called in the torturers, and they brought whips for the villain. Even though burned and cut, he held out a long time and nearly overcame the tortures. But conscience is strong in everyone, and the truth is all-powerful. (3.4.12-13)

The description suggests a valiant fight by Theron, who is ultimately overcome not by violent force but by the force of his own conscience.

Callirhoe's kidnapping by pirates serves to further the plot,[745] but it does not require a specific bandit leader who deliberates and debates.[746] The apparent popularity of the *Laureolus* mime suggests an existing audience who could appreciate Theron's crime and punishment. Contemporary performance culture, literature and the dangerous reality of inter-polis travel combine to provide a possible context for Chariton's extended treatment of a peripheral character. Although it is not possible to prove that Theron's actions in Chariton directly mirror those of Laureolus in Valerius Catullus' mime, it is possible that Chariton's audience could have recognised parallels in the literary and mimic careers of the two bandits. Theron's trial, torture and execution are as much entertainment as they are legal proceedings.[747] His crucifixion is specifically set and staged in front of Callirhoe's tomb to associate the punishment with the crime. Theron also delivers one of the most memorable and entertaining speeches in the novel, when he argues against attempting to sell Callirhoe as a slave in Athens. Chariton lampoons Athenians for their *polypragmosune* and love of lawsuits.

The story of Theron, coupled with the suitors' plot, offers evidence for a dialogue between mime and Chariton's novel. In the suitors' plot, he uses mime

[745] See MacKay (1963) for a discussion of the use of bandits as a device to move a plot forward.
[746] The main bandit in Xenophon of Ephesus' *Ephesian Tale* is a named character, Hippothoos, but he becomes an integral part of the narrative with a romantic backstory of his own.
[747] Trial scenes were common in mime. Kehoe (1984: 99), Philo *Embassy to Gaius* 359. In Chariton, both of the trials in Syracuse take place in the θέατρον.

to subvert audience expectations and heighten the emotional conclusion of the episode. Here, he again introduces a mime plot into the narrative. Theron's functional role in the narrative is to propel the protagonists away on their adventures. An allusion to mime adds depth and interest to a character who is essentially a narrative device, turning him into one of the most memorable characters in the novel.[748]

Mime Traditions and Achilles Tatius

In chapter six I discussed the adultery mime in Achilles Tatius. Here, I briefly return to that theme and consider the possibility of a relationship between the novel and the papyrus fragment P. Berol inv. 13927, which includes the name 'Leucippe'. Although it is impossible to confidently link the novel and the papyrus, there is also no foolproof way to disprove a relationship. Given this, I will explore the possibility in full and present a potential model of two-way traffic between subliterary performance and literary works. P. Berol inv. 13927 was sold on the antiquarian market in the 1920s; its provenance and discovery context are unknown, though it has been dated to the fifth or sixth centuries CE through palaeography. It may appear to be a departure from my remit to discuss a papyrus dating so much later than Achilles Tatius' work, as my focus is on the performance aspects within the novels, not any that may stem from them. However, it is crucial to acknowledge that influence could flow in both directions. The characters Parthenope and Metiochus, the protagonists of an ancient Greek novel surviving only in fragments, were also, it appears, characters

[748] Kasprzyk (2001), Schmeling (1974: 144), Perry (1930: 118).

on the pantomime stage.[749] This could prompt the question—do novels stem from stage performances, or performances from the novels? The answer may not lie in the binary of such a chicken/egg conundrum. The 'Leucippe' of P. Berol inv. 13927 may represent a more complex example of the circle of influences on both stage and page. In the case that the papyrus and the novel do share more than a name, an exciting interplay between popular performance and the novel begins to appear.

In P. Berol inv. 13927, the name 'Leucippe' is found at the head of a list of what appear to be stage props, for a performance titled 'Leucippe'. In the *editio princeps*, Georges Manteuffel associated the fragment with Achilles Tatius' novel on the basis of the name 'Leucippe', acknowledging that mimes were closely connected to ancient novel plots.[750] Since then, the coincidence in name has tantalised and divided scholars.[751] Elisa Mignogna revived the argument to speculate on the implications of such a connection and offer a reconstruction of the mime plot. More recently, Serena Perrone conceded 'the reciprocal influences between the genre of romance and the world of popular entertainment are undeniable' yet argued against any relationship between the Leucippe of Achilles Tatius and that of P. Berol inv. 13927.[752] I believe there is a middle ground between Mignogna's and Perrone's arguments that leaves room for speculation while acknowledging the challenges of a definite identification of the papyrus Leucippe's origins.

[749] Lucian, *De Salt.* 54; Lucian, *Pseudologista* 25. Hägg and Utas (2003: 47-52, 61, 190-191); Mignogna (1996b: 163).
[750] Manteuffel (1929: 33), '*mimos cum fabulis romanensibus artissime cohaerere*'.
[751] Cazzaniga (1958: 19), Wiemken (1972: 252 n 21), and Cunningham (1987) doubt any relationship to the novel, Körte (1932: 64) remains open-minded, Mignogna (1996a) and (1996b) argues in favour.
[752] Mignogna (1996a) and (1996b), Perrone (2011).

P. Berol inv. 13927 contains a numbered list of what appear to be the titles of (short) performances. This is followed by a list of stage properties required for each performance. The stage properties for 'Leucippe' are found on the bottom half of column 1:

ὑπομνηστικὸν χορηγίας[753]

Λευκίππης

ἐ]ργαστήρ(ιον) κουρέος

κουρικά

ἴσωπτρον

φασκίας

κιβάρια γ τῇ γραήδ(ι)

ζωνοβαλλάντιν

γλωσόκομον χάρτ(ων)

τὰ τοῦ χαλκέος

σφῦραν σπάθην

τὸ ἰκόνιν

σενδόνιν προμ.( )

η[

'Memorandum of the stage properties

of Leucippe

barber's shop

barber's tools (or chairs?)

[753] I reproduce Perrone's edition of the fragment, which is the latest edition (to my knowledge). The line numbering adheres to the *editio princeps*.

mirror

pieces of cloth(?)[754]

3 loaves of bread for an old woman

a waist belt

a document box

blacksmith's tools

hammer and tongs

a little picture

cloth/garment(?)

(?)' [755]

According to the first item on the list, it seems that the performance took place in a barbershop. The title and stage properties suggest the possible cast of characters included a 'Leucippe', a barber, an old woman and a blacksmith.[756]

Barbershops could have been a conventional setting for mime. In Petronius 64.9, there is mention of some sort of barbershop performance (*tonstrinum*).[757] In Plutarch, a barbershop becomes the setting for performance, particularly for the mimic abilities of a crow.[758] Barbershops may have been regarded as a public space and a place for entertainment. P. Berol inv. 13927's barbershop setting, complete with barber's tools/chairs and a mirror, would fit within such a tradition.

[754] As Michael Trapp has observed to me, if φασκίας = Lat. *fasciae*, this could mean 'bras'.
[755] Certain items on the list are more difficult to identify than others, though the name 'Leucippe' is not disputed. For slightly different readings, see Manteuffel (1929), Cazzaniga (1958), and Cunningham (2002).
[756] Mignogna (1996b), Perrone (2011: 141).
[757] For a thorough investigation into mime in Petronius, see Panayotakis (1995).
[758] Plutarch, *de sollertia animalium* 973 b-e.

I will make no attempt to fully reconstruct the plot of the mime, which is impossible from a list of props—especially since mime, if it at all resembled modern slapstick, would probably involve the use of common tools for uncommon purposes. Nonetheless, it is not impossible to imagine situations in which the characters and stage properties of 'Leucippe' could be combined in a plausible performance, without borrowing an explanation from an external source such as Achilles Tatius. Old women are found in comedy and tragedy, ranging from Aristophanes and Euripides to Herodas.[759] Lists of known mime performances include titles regarding several ordinary professions, such as fishermen and fullers.[760] Choricius mentions mimes playing sausage-sellers, bakers and contract makers.[761] Perhaps a blacksmith could fit into this category. Within the context of daily urban life, an old woman and a blacksmith could enter a barbershop. The mime could be entirely original, or it could belong to the barbershop tradition hinted at in sources, without any solid connection to any external Leucippe.

At first glance, it seems difficult to align the Leucippe 'mime' and *Leucippe and Clitophon*. That is, until we consider Leucippe's haircut. After her kidnapping, Leucippe becomes a slave on Melite's estate and her hair is shorn as a punishment. This haircut serves as a disguise that prevents Clitophon from recognising his beloved, who at this point calls herself 'Lacaena'.[762] When the newly married Clitophon and Melite arrive at her estate, they are greeted by the ill-treated 'Lacaena'. She is described as

[759] Particularly Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* and *Ecclesiasousae*, and Herodas 1.
[760] For extant mime text and fragments, see Bonaria (1955-1956), Bonaria (1965) and Panayotakis (2010).
[761] Choricius, *Apol. mim*. 110.
[762] Although Clitophon does notice that there is 'something of Leucippe about her' (τι ἐδόκει Λευκίππης ἔχειν, 5.17.7).

> γυνή, χοίνιξι παχείαις δεδεμένη, δίκελλαν κρατοῦσα, τὴν κεφαλὴν κεκαρμένη, ἐρρυπωμένη τὸ σῶμα, χιτῶνα ἀνεζωσμένη ἄθλιον πάνυ,
>
> a woman wearing heavy shackles and holding a pitchfork, her head shorn, her body dirty, wearing an utterly wretched garment hitched up. (5.17.3)

After 'Lacaena's' true identity is discovered, Satyrus observes,

> καὶ τότε μὲν οὖν οὐδ' ἂν ἄλλος αὐτὴν ἰδὼν γνωρίσειεν, ἔφηβον οὕτω γενομένην· τοῦτο γὰρ ἡ τῶν τριχῶν αὐτῆς κουρὰ μόνον ἐνήλλαξεν,
>
> at the time no one would recognise her at all, she had become like a youth— for just cutting off of her hair had changed her thus (5.19.2)

Later, when recounting their adventures to Leucippe's father, Clitophon mentions that Leucippe 'has been stripped of the beauty of her head' (σεσύληται τῆς κεφαλῆς τὸ κάλλος, 8.5.4). The repeated mention of Leucippe's haircut enforces its importance. It is possible that the haircut is not just a disguise or insult, but also a signal of subliterary interference. Synesius mentions a bald-headed performer who 'is bald by art, not by nature, who goes to barbers' shops many times a day' (ἐστι μὲν τῶν τέχνῃ φαλακρῶν, οὐ τῶν φύσει, βαδίζων ἐπὶ τὰ κουρεῖα τῆς ἡμέρας πολλάκις).[763] A shaved head, it seems, was a characteristic of a certain mime 'stock' character—the *calvus* or *stupidus* in Latin, the μωρός in Greek.[764] In addition, baldness appears to have featured in popular humour, even off the stage. The *Philogelos* contains a joke with not just a bald character, but a barber who shaves another man bald.[765] Leucippe's haircut also places her within an established literary tradition of women losing their locks by force, for love

[763] Synesius, *In Praise of Baldness* 13.4. John Chrysostom *Peri Metanoias* b 291 also mentions the mime actor's need to be shaved bald.
[764] Panayotakis (1995: xxvii-iii, 29). Juvenal, *Sat.* 5.171-172 mentions the blows a bald character receives.
[765] *Philogelos* 56. In summary: a jughead, a bald man, and a barber go camping and agree to take watch separately during the night. During his watch, the barber shaves the jughead bald, then wakes him. The jughead rubs his scalp and complains, 'The barber woke the baldy instead of me!'

(perhaps best represented in Menander's *Perikeiromene*).[766] This combination of possible resonances appears to me to an apt representation of the way the novels can simultaneously bring to mind high and low culture elements.

Mignogna suggests that the 'Leucippe' mime could be a reimagining of Leucippe's haircut in a comic key ('*chiave comica'*), wherein Leucippe's high status clashes with the 'low-class' setting, with her shaved head and chains offering an audience a certain voyeuristic and sadistic kind of pleasure.[767] She attempts to explain each stage property and how it could relate to the plot of Achilles Tatius. The old woman is a confidante to whom Leucippe can air her grievances (as found in Apuleius and Heliodorus), the blacksmith is there to tend to her chains, the barber gives her the infamous haircut. The 'little picture', Mignogna asserts, could be an image of Clitophon (images of the beloved feature in other novels, though not in Achilles Tatius).[768] Her reconstruction of the mime is naturally conjectural, and mainly consists of placing Achilles Tatius' Leucippe in the incongruous context of a barbershop. This interpretation requires that the 'Leucippe' mime be a very specific response to the novel's Leucippe, in which every aspect of the mime has a direct relationship to the novel, or at least the novel genre. At this micro-level of searching for one-to-one equivalences, the model of the literary and subliterary dialogue does not hold up to scrutiny. It is perilous to reconstruct a performance from the papyrus, especially on the premise of a perfect synchronisation of literary and subliterary.

On the other side of the spectrum, Perrone's argument against a one-to-one connection with Achilles Tatius relies on the existence of other 'Leucippes' found in literature and myth. For example, the name 'Leucippe' is attributed to

[766] Mignogna (1996b: 164).
[767] Mignogna (1996b: 165).
[768] Mignogna (1996b: 165-166).

the mother of King Aegyptus and in one of Hyginus' *fabulae* a woman named Leucippe cuts off her hair and dresses as a priest of Apollo (hijinks ensue when her long-lost sister falls in love with Leucippe's cross-dressed persona).[769] In another tale, a female child is raised as a boy named Leukippos. Perrone conjectures that the mime could represent scenes from the Hyginus tale, which involves a haircut and a change of clothing. The blacksmith's tools could have been used to free Leucippe and her father from the chains placed upon them later in the story. She admits that this is 'straying into the realm of excessive speculation'. Her suggestion also falls into the same dangerous territory for which she doubts Mignogna's reconstruction: one-to-one correlation. Perrone concludes the Leucippe of mime lacks 'sufficient evidence' to be identified with any specific character, yet also claims it is 'highly likely' that the mime would have a cross-dressing/sex-change elements, as such motifs are found in several Leucippe tales.[770] It is surprising that the one aspect of the performance about which Perrone is most willing to conjecture is one that can in no way be extrapolated from the items listed on the papyrus. She must rely on external sources and make the choice to align the papyrus Leucippe with specific external Leucippes. Her speculation, based on elements only found in some Leucippe tales, is perhaps no less dangerous than Mignogna's.

Perrone is certainly right to acknowledge the multiple possible Leucippes. An audience member watching the Leucippe mime could be reminded of any of these Leucippes, whether explicit in the performance or not. I am choosing to focus on the possibility of resonances with Achilles Tatius' Leucippe, but it does not have to be the only resonance. The possibility of

[769] ps-Plutarch, *de fluviis* 16.1, 16.5f; Thrasyllus *Aegyptiaka*; Antoninus Liberalis 17; Hyginus *fab* 190 Marshall.
[770] Perrone (2011: 146).

multiple sources does not diminish the breadth of possible audience response/recognition, but rather broadens it. Nor must the choice of the name Leucippe stem from a single tradition. There is a chain of receptions to consider—of situations, genres, even names. The name Leucippe could be filtered through any number of popular or literary sources and still could retain meanings from earlier or different ones. For example, the name Scarlett could bring to mind Robin Hood's companion Will Scarlett, the femme fatale Scarlett O'Hara, or the movie star Scarlett Johanssen—or all three together. When someone is labelled a 'Romeo' or a 'Casanova', a personal name is being employed to describe a trait. In a similar fashion, it is possible that the name 'Leucippe' led an audience to certain presuppositions about the character's nature.

In Achilles Tatius, the repeated references to Leucippe's shaved head, particularly as a disguise or costume, might bring up mimic resonances for a reader of the text. Bald characters are the fools of mime, the butts of jokes. They are also often the cuckold character in mime. As discussed in chapter six, the arrival of Clitophon with his 'wife' sets off a series of events that resembles elements of an adultery mime. I discussed the way in which Achilles Tatius adds additional elements, doubling or even tripling the usual amount of adultery. Leucippe's baldness may help cast her into the role of the cuckold, placing another twist on the typical adultery mime by introducing not a *calvus* but *calva*. In an accusatory letter to Clitophon, Leucippe asks if the trials she has endured were 'so that I might become to another man what you have become to another woman?' (ἵνα σὺ ὃ γέγονας ἄλλῃ γυναικί, καὶ ἐγώ τῳ ἑτέρῳ ἀνδρὶ γένωμαι; 5.18.4). She refers to Clitophon's marriage at the start and finish of the letter, as

well as twice in between. Clitophon admits that the letter makes him feel 'like an adulterer caught in the act' (ὥσπερ ἐπ᾽ αὐτοφώρῳ μοιχὸς κατειλημμένος, 5.19.6). That Leucippe considers Clitophon her husband seems clear from her monologue in book six, when she wishes to exclaim 'my husband Clitophon, husband of Leucippe alone, faithful and steadfast!' (Ἄνερ Κλειτοφῶν, Λευκίππης μόνης ἄνερ, πιστὲ καὶ βέβαιε, 6.16.3). This characterisation of cuckold and adulterer could perhaps be compounded by the fact that Clitophon, in respect for the 'memory' of Leucippe, had not yet consummated his marriage with Melite— but does so after Melite has recovered her lost husband and he has found Leucippe, when it is adultery indeed.

If mime is one of the multiple influences on the novel, is it possible that the novel's mime resonances could find their way back into mime, even indirectly? Achilles Tatius and P. Berol inv. 13927 could reflect an influence "loop"—a true dialogue, with elements that interpenetrate and mutually reinforce each other. Perhaps Leucippe's haircut in Achilles Tatius and the performance mentioned in the papyrus do have a relationship, mediated by traditions in sub-literary performance culture. Leucippe's baldness could reflect the bald buffoons of mime, while the P. Berol inv. 13927 could reintroduce the bald Leucippe into a different mime genre. We can have traffic upstream and downstream. By making this connection I am singling out one pathway of reception that was possible within the horizon of literary expectations of novel readers and within the context of performance knowledge and experience of the first several centuries CE. While it is certainly impossible to prove any direct, intentional, one-to-one correspondence, it seems even more impossible to completely shut the door on any possibility of influence.

Pantomime and Achilles Tatius

Achilles Tatius might refer to pantomime in his novel, on different levels. Early in the novel, Clitophon's cousin Clinias reveals knowledge of the stage in a speech intended to dissuade his young male lover from agreeing to marry a woman (1.8.1-11). At a later juncture (5.3.4-8, 5.5.1-9), Clitophon recounts a myth with ties to the pantomime genre. One of these is an explicit theatrical reference, suggesting that Clinias is aware of contemporary performances, perhaps even a theatre-goer. Clitophon's story, on the other hand, contains a subtler sort of subliterary interference, which may have been noticeable to a pantomime enthusiast. In a sense, Clinias' earlier speech provides the basis for further exploration of pantomime resonances within the novel. It places performance, very likely pantomime performance, as a topic known to characters within the novel and suggests an expectation of knowledge on the part of the reader.

Clinias abuses 'women's doings' (γυναικῶν δράματα), cataloguing several 'stories of the sort with which women fill the stage' (ὅσων ἐνέπλησαν μύθων γυναῖκες τὴν σκηνήν, 1.8.4). He lists 'Eriphyle's necklace, Philomela's feast, Sthenoboea's false accusation, Aerope's wicked stratagem, Procne's murder' (ὁ ὅρμος Ἐριφύλης, Φιλομήλας ἡ τράπεζα, Σθενοβοίας ἡ διαβολή, Ἀερόπης ἡ κλοπή, Πρόκνης ἡ σφαγή, 1.8.4). Clinias' list sounds remarkably similar to Criton's diatribe at the beginning of Lucian's *De Saltatione*. Criton complains pantomime showcases 'lovesick women, the lewdest ones in

antiquity' (ἐρωτικὰ γύναια, τῶν πάλαι τὰς μαχλοτάτας).[771] Clinias' list of female-centred dramatic performances with a clear mythological lineage suggests a familiarity with the theatre and, one could safely say, most specifically with the two branches of dramatic performance that are myth-centred, tragedy and pantomime.

Clinias' speech is the first mention of the Philomela and Procne story, which features more prominently later in the novel (and in my second pantomime example) but is introduced in the first book. The story of the silenced Philomela and her attempt to speak without words was a staple of Roman pantomime.[772] The schemes of Stheneboea and Aerope appear to have also graced the pantomime stage, as both are mentioned in Lucian.[773] Clinias' list of unsavoury women continues with examples best known today from Hesiod, Herodotus and Homer,[774] such as Penelope (whom he blames for the deaths of her suitors) and the wife of Candaules, alongside Phaedra and Clytemnaestra, though he does not specify that they are literary characters in contrast to those found on the stage.[775] It is possible that all of these women were to be found in pantomime. In fact, pantomime may have been the primary reference point for some readers or even Clinias himself. Phaedra, Clytemnaestra and Stheneboea were also characters in Attic tragedy, which may explain their place in pantomime, as tragic themes were popular pantomime fare.[776] Some pantomime libretti were based on particular tragic plays, somehow adapted to fit the new

[771] Criton names different women, however: Phaedra, Parthenope and Rhodope. Lucian, *De Salt.* 2.
[772] Juvenal, *Sat.* 6.643-656; Apuleius, *Apol.* 78. Richlin (1992: 165), Hall (2002: 29-30), Hall (2008a: 29), Feldherr (2010: 210 n 16).
[773] Lucian, *De Salt.* 42, 43, 67.
[774] Whitmarsh (2011: 103).
[775] Lucian, among his over-the-top boasts about the educational value of pantomime, claims the dancer knows the work of Homer, Hesiod and the 'best poets' (ἀρίστων ποιητῶν) as well as tragedy. Lucian, *De Salt.* 61.
[776] Lucian, *De Salt.* 2, 42, 43.

performance aesthetic.[777] It is impossible to pinpoint what performance genre Clinias intends, if he even means to be specific. That said, his choice of lofty mythological characters appears to point to tragedy or pantomime.

Despite his own disdain for the fairer sex, Clinias does offer Clitophon relationship advice, employing a theatrical term. He tells Clitophon to win a girl's affections using a persistent yet delicate approach, and admonishes 'you must act as choregos, or you will lose your drama' (χορήγησον τὴν ὑπόκρισιν, μὴ ἀπολέσῃς σου τὸ δρᾶμα, 1.10.7). Gaselee claims this metaphor is based on the Attic conventions of preparing a drama, meaning that Clitophon must be a *choregos* or else the play will not be accepted into the dramatic competition and he will 'have wasted all the trouble you took in composing it'.[778] His explanation puzzlingly conflates the role of *choregos* with the role of playwright and does little to elucidate Clinias' meaning. More recently Helen Morales has noted that while theatrical metaphors were common in antiquity, the use of the term *choregos* is unique in that it is a very specific technical term. According to her interpretation of the word, the *choregos* was involved in the direction of the theatrical production. For Morales, the metaphor is

> a more fitting image, perhaps, for the knowing narrator who controls the narrative perspective than for the younger, rather inept Clitophon.[779]

She refers to the novel's first narrator, the unnamed individual who invites Clitophon to tell his tale. Her comments fail to explain the metaphor in its context as advice for Clitophon, or why Clinias would use such a technical term. Peter Wilson in his volume on *choregoi* explains that the Classical *choregos* was

[777] For example, Sophocles' Ajax can be compared to the rudimentary plot of a pantomime Ajax summarised by Lucian, *De Salt*. 83-84.
[778] Gaselee (1984: 36-37 n 1).
[779] Morales (2004: 63).

> the figure ready to provide whatever might be needed' by his chorus, which 'largely explains the linguistic development of the word χορηγεῖν to mean simply 'to provide'.[780]

Seduction, it appears, is like a theatrical production, and Clinias encourages Clitophon to marshal all of his resources if he wants it to succeed.

Clinias reveals his familiarity with the stage through his list of dangerous women. His subsequent misfortune falls within a tragic performance tradition, in keeping with the sort of stage examples he enumerates. Clinias urges his lover to shun women (though not men), and Charicles suffers a fate reminiscent of the most famous tragic advocate of celibacy—Hippolytus. Clinias gives Charicles a horse, who spooks and throws his new rider. His body tangles in the reins and he is dragged along the ground. Charicles' fatal accident shares elements with the death of Hippolytus as described in Euripides' text. The servant who announces and describes his death (1.12.2-6), plays a similar role to that of a messenger in tragedy.[781] As in *Hippolytus*, Charicles is the victim of a frightened horse (in Hippolytus' case, several horses) and, like Hippolytus, his body is dragged, tangled in the reins. Charicles does not live long enough to speak to his father, as Hippolytus does in Euripides' text, however his body is brought in on a bier and his father laments over him (τοῦ θρήνου, 1.13.2-6). The young man's demise is not a retelling of the Hippolytus story, and does not hold up to one-to-one comparisons. Nonetheless, the Hippolytus story is recognisable to those familiar with the tragedy, though it could have been just as recognisable to one familiar with a mythographic account, a solo tragic aria or a version from another performance genre. The scene further diverges from Classical tragedy when Clinias joins the mourning, adding his own cries and turning the scene into a

[780] Wilson (2000: 71).
[781] Euripides, *Hippolytus* 1173-1254.

'contest of laments' (θρήνων ἅμιλλα, 1.14.1). This agonistic depiction makes it sound as if Charicles' father and Clinias are competing *tragoidoi* at a festival.

The story of Clinias and Charicles does not function to propel the plot of *Leucippe and Clitophon*, but does introduce the themes of love and loss against which Clitophon's later adventures can be measured. The episode is coloured by performance culture. Clinias uses the women of the stage to argue a point in a debate, and perhaps suggests that episodes from Herodotus graced the contemporary stage. He also uses theatrical terminology as a model of behaviour for his cousin. The conclusion of the episode, the death of Charicles, resonates not only with Classical tragedy, but with more contemporary performances by *tragoidoi* who sang emotional, spoken passages from tragedy.[782] As with Cnemon in Heliodorus, Clinias' theatrical outlook becomes intertwined with the events of his own life.[783]

At the beginning of book 5, we encounter another episode that resonates with performance culture. Clitophon and his beloved Leucippe have just arrived in Alexandria and are on their way to a dinner party when Leucippe is struck on the head by a hawk. Clitophon then spies a piece of art displayed nearby. He describes this piece of art—a depiction of the story of Tereus, Philomela and Prokne. Philomela is pointing and Prokne nods her head as she gazes on the robe Philomela has woven. Clitophon recounts the scene on the robe in great detail—Philomela's struggles against Tereus. This is followed by a description of the women serving their revenge feast and Tereus' angry reaction—he brandishes

[782] Gentili (1979: 28), Hall (2002: 15-18).
[783] Both characters even experience episodes associated with the Hippolytus myth, though different portions of it.

his sword and is in the process of knocking over a table.[784] Clitophon does not mention any birds. Leucippe asks about the meaning of the myth, the birds, and the man in the painting. Clitophon first identifies the birds, then recounts the Tereus tale in a linear fashion (5.5.1-9). Leucippe resembles the category of spectators who know little to nothing about mythology and require narrative exposition—in front of a work of art, as here, or before a pantomime performance. Augustine mentions heralds who would relate the story before a pantomime, and Libanius argues pantomime can serve as an education in mythology.[785]

Vayos Liapis, in an article and an addendum in *Classical Quarterly*, discusses the possibility that Achilles Tatius was familiar with the text of Sophocle's *Tereus*, or whether he had access to literary reworkings such as Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 6 or 'such subliterary material as tragic hypotheses and

[784] 'It showed the violent rape of Philomela by Tereus, and the cutting out of her tongue. The entire narrative of the drama was in the picture: the robe, Tereus, the banquet table. A maid was standing holding the unfolded robe, Philomela stood by pointing a finger on the robe and indicating the woven images. Procne nodded at this proof and stared fiercely, enraged by the picture: the Thracian Tereus was woven wrestling with Philomela for Aphrodite's prize. The woman's hair was torn, her girdle undone, her chiton ripped, her torso half-exposed. She dug into Tereus' eyes with her right hand, while with her left she held up the shreds of her dress over her breasts. Tereus held Philomela in his arms, pulling her towards him within them, binding her in a skin-to-skin embrace. Thus was the image the artist wove into the robe. In the remainder of the painting the women showed Tereus the leftovers of the feast in a basket, the head and hands of his son, as the women both rejoiced and cowered. Tereus was depicted leaping from his couch, waving his sword at the women and kicking his leg against the table. This was neither standing nor fallen, but the picture indicated that it was about to fall…' (Φιλομήλας γὰρ εἶχε φθορὰν καὶ τὴν βίαν Τηρέως καὶ τῆς γλώττης τὴν τομήν. ἦν δὲ ὁλόκληρον τῇ γραφῇ τὸ διήγημα τοῦ δράματος, ὁ πέπλος, ὁ Τηρεύς, ἡ τράπεζα. τὸν πέπλον ἡπλωμένον εἱστήκει κρατοῦσα θεράπαινα· Φιλομήλα παρειστήκει καὶ ἐπετίθει τῷ πέπλῳ τὸν δάκτυλον καὶ ἐδείκνυε τῶν ὑφασμάτων τὰς γραφάς· ἡ Πρόκνη πρὸς τὴν δεῖξιν ἐνενεύκει καὶ δριμὺ ἔβλεπε καὶ ὠργίζετο τῇ γραφῇ. Θρᾳξ ὁ Τηρεὺς ἐνύφαντο Φιλομήλᾳ παλαίων πάλην Ἀφροδισίον. ἐσπάρακτο τὰς κόμας ἡ γυνή, τὸ ζῶσμα ἐλέλυτο, τὸν χιτῶνα κατέρρηκτο, ἡμίγυμνος τὸ στέρνον ἦν, τὴν δεξιὰν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἤρειδε τοῦ Τηρέως, τῇ λαιᾷ τὰ διερρωγότα τοῦ χιτῶνος ἐπὶ τοὺς μαζοὺς ἔκλειεν. <ἐν> ἀγκάλαις εἶχε τὴν Φιλομήλαν ὁ Τηρεύς, ἕλκων πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ὡς ἐνῆν τὸ σῶμα καὶ σφίγγων ἐν χρῷ τὴν συμπλοκήν· ὧδε μὲν τὴν τοῦ πέπλου γραφὴν ὕφηνεν ὁ ζωγράφος. τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν τῆς εἰκόνος, αἱ γυναῖκες ἐν κανῷ τὰ λείψανα τοῦ δείπνου τῷ Τηρεῖ δεικνύουσι, κεφαλὴν τοῦ παιδὸς καὶ χεῖρας· γελῶσι δὲ ἅμα καὶ φοβοῦνται. ἀναπηδῶν ἐκ τῆς κλίνης ὁ Τηρεὺς ἐγέγραπτο, καὶ ἕλκων τὸ ξίφος ἐπὶ τὰς γυναῖκας τὸ σκέλος ἤρειδεν ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν· ἡ δὲ οὔτε ἕστηκεν οὔτε πέπτωκεν, ἀλλ᾽ ἐδείκνυε γραφὴν μέλλοντος πτώματος, 5.3.4-8).

[785] Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine* 2.25.38; Libanius, *Or.* 64.112.

mythographic accounts'.[786] Mythographic accounts are a significant, if often overlooked, category. Many such works, including Parthenius' *Love Stories*, were produced in the Hellenistic period, and it is not impossible that a novelist could have looked to a mythographic collection for inspiration. It is also possible that some of these accounts were digests of primary readings, such as a corpus of tragedies.

Instead of focusing on a filtered access to *Tereus*, Liapis' line of reasoning leads him to claim that not only is it possible that Achilles Tatius had access to Sophocles' text, but also that there is a possible line quotation, or rather paraphrase, from the tragic text. Liapis claims 'what we are seeking to establish is not that Tatius has preserved an intact tragic fragment, but rather that direct and thorough knowledge of a classical Tereus-tragedy informs Tatius' treatment of the Tereus myth'.[787] Liapis' approach appears to be symptomatic of the scholarly tendency to focus on texts of Classical tragedy when discussing the influence of drama, particularly tragedy, at the expense of acknowledging the massive diffusion of tragedy into the cultural imagination in all kinds of other non-textual ways, for example via art or performance. Although Liapis acknowledges that other portions of Achilles Tatius may involve pantomime or mythological burlesque,[788] he does not appear to be open to such possibilities in this episode in the novel. Although one cannot prove non-textual interference with the Tereus myth as narrated by Clitophon, one cannot prove the absence of subliterary influences. It is perhaps an unnecessarily blinkered approach to focus on the possibility of a direct or paraphrased quotation.

[786] Liapis (2006: 220).
[787] Liapis (2006: 224-225).
[788] Liapis (2006: 220).

One of the novel's most memorable moments relies on stage props belonging to a Homerist (as discussed in chapter four). Beyond such overt theatrical references, there is also a sense of performance in the narration of the novel and especially in this episode's *ekphrases*, which target three audiences. Recognising these layers is part of the enjoyment of reading the text. Clitophon tells the Tereus story twice, first through describing the painting to his interlocutor and second in explaining the artwork to Leucippe. Achilles Tatius, in turn, provides two tales to his reader. This double story may have some bearing on the 'hermeneutics of the narrative',[789] and it also reminds a reader of the many ways to communicate a story—in this case through the visual arts, *ekphrasis* and exposition. Considering Achilles Tatius takes a multilayered approach to the Tereus story, it may be reductive to attribute the story's content to one specific text.

Liapis singles out the phrase ἔδνα τῶν γάμων αὐτῇ δίδωσι μηκέτι λαλεῖν as a possible quotation or paraphrase (5.5.4). He provides two examples of ways to manipulate the phrase into scanning in iambic trimeter.[790] It may be a coincidence that with some creativity these fifteen syllables can be set to a meter. Aristotle claims that iambic trimeter is the closest meter to common speech, and it is also the meter for spoken passages in tragedy.[791] Even if the line is intentionally almost metrical, its similarity to a meter used in tragedy does not prove it came specifically from Sophocles' *Tereus*, or indeed from any specific

[789] Morales (2004: 179).
[790] Liapis (2006) suggests:

< x _ u _ x _ u > ἔδνα τῶν γάμων
αὐτῇ δίδωσι μηκέτι ‡λαλεῖν

Liapis (2008) contains the (corrected) suggestion by David Kovacs:

< x _ u _ x _ u > ἔδνα τῶν γάμων
δίδωσιν αὐτῇ μή τι γηρύειν ἔτι

[791] Aristotle, *Poetics* 1449a25-29.

tragedy. The phrase occurs in the story Clitophon tells Leucippe, and as he makes clear in book one, Clitophon wishes to impress the girl with his erudition. It is possible he elevates his language accordingly, almost in a burlesque of tragedy.

Liapis also points to the line's 'tragic' subject matter in the trope of the 'perverted gift', though he notes that word used for gift, ἔδνα, is rare in extant tragedy.[792] The rarity in itself does not prove the phrase could never belong to a tragedy, but it does help suggest that the line may not be purely, classically tragic. The story's plot suits the concept of the perverted wedding gift. Though the theme is found in tragedy, it would not be impossible to find it somewhere else, for instance in pantomime. Many pantomime plots come from tragedy, and pantomime libretti could even have been adapted from tragic texts. It is as possible that Achilles Tatius' phrase came from a quotation or paraphrase from a libretto—read or heard as part of a performance—as the phrase coming directly from a tragic text.

Pantomime libretti may have been ephemera, used for a single performance and then discarded. It is also possible that pantomime libretti were preserved, some even extant today, but difficult to identify and impossible to prove.[793] If Achilles Tatius did not have access to a libretto, or to a complete version of Sophocles' text, he may have come in contact with collections of tragic extracts, hypotheses, or another reworking such as Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Ovid's work was a much more recent treatment of the myth. Liapis lists six similarities between Achilles Tatius' version and Ovid's, which he claims

[792] Liapis (2006: 222, 225).
[793] Hall (2008b: esp. 258-259, 282).

suggest that Ovid and Achilles Tatius share Sophocles as their source.[794] Perhaps, or perhaps they share other sources, or Achilles Tatius borrows from Ovid. One of the more striking examples is that both texts mention Philomela using her hands for speech. In Ovid, her hands serve as a voice, *pro voce manus fuit*,[795] and Clitophon claims her hand imitated her tongue, (μιμεῖται τὴν γλῶτταν ἡ χείρ, 5.5.4).

The textual tradition is but one side of the coin. It does not represent everything with which Achilles Tatius could have been in contact. Trying to force the minimal evidence to fit a textual filiation model is counterintuitive. Instead, it may be more fruitful to explore a variety of options, contemporary performance contexts included. Some of Achilles Tatius' *ekphrasis* could have been influenced by live performance of a version of the Tereus myth. It is even possible that some knowledge of the Sophoclean version could have come from a performance by a *tragoidos*, singing portions of *Tereus*,[796] though the relationship between an imperial period tragic aria and Sophocles' text may have been tenuous indeed. Closely aligned with tragedy is, of course, pantomime. Although pantomime exploded into popularity in the last decades of 1st cent BCE and in the 1st century CE, it isn't until the 2nd century that we find evidence of pantomimes competing in public festivals on the same footing as other performers such as comic and tragic actors.[797] By Achilles Tatius' time, mimes and pantomimes would have been established festival performers. Philomela is an attested pantomime character, and the tale itself is well-suited to the

[794] Liapis (2006: 227-237).
[795] Ovid, *Met.* 6.609.
[796] Though Liapis' tragic phrase is set in iambics, which would have been spoken in Classical tragedy, even portions of text that were originally spoken were sung by *tragoidoi*. Hall (2002) 16-18.
[797] Price (1984: 89), Hunt (2008: 182).

pantomime genre.[798] It combines elements that were pantomime staples: illicit love, metamorphosis and strong emotion, particularly tied to female figures. Tereus' attraction to and treatment of Philomela, her disclosure, the women's revenge and their final transformation into birds would be excellent material for a talented dancer or troupe.

Philomela is herself an excellent allegory for the art of the pantomime dancer—someone who must find a way to tell her story without using her own voice. Her tale easily supports the art of pantomime by conveying the value of wordless, bodily communication. In the myth Philomela uses her hands to weave a tapestry, while the pantomime dancer uses their body to create a visual representation. Weaving is a prime metaphor for the imagistic work created by pantomime. Nonnus refers to an eloquent silence and twirling hands (αὐδήεσσα σιωπή/ δάκτυλα δινεύουσα) and specifically to 'weaving with a clever sign an intelligent rhythm' (νεύματι τεχνήεντι νοήμονα ῥυθμὸν ὑφαίνων).[799] Specifically in reference to the Philomela story, Nonnus refers to the garment 'speaking' (λάλον),[800] a similar reference to the phrases in Achilles Tatius and Ovid regarding Philomela's hands speaking for her. In Clitophon's speech to Leucippe, he explains that 'Philomela's craft discovered silent speech' (ἡ γὰρ Φιλομήλας τέχνη σιωπῶσαν ηὕρηκε φωνήν, 5.4.4). Though the literal reference is to Philomela's handiwork, the image also evokes the famous hand gestures of the pantomime, which were integral to the dancer's choreographic storytelling.

[798] Montiglio (1999: 270).
[799] Nonnus *Dionysiaca* 19.157 and 19.202. Montiglio (1999: 269), Lada-Richards (2007: 185 n 45).
[800] Nonnus *Dionysiaca* 4.321. Montiglio (1999: 270).

Novel readers could have been familiar with the Latin literature such as the Aeneid from pantomime.[801] A pantomime based on the Philomela tale could have included material from Ovid or Sophocles. As Galinsky, Lada-Richards and Ingleheart have noted, the subject matter of Ovid's work fits very neatly with the range of material that Lucian attributes to pantomime's repertoire. [802] *Metamorphoses* contains evidence of pantomime interference, as is drawn out by Lada-Richards, and the work could have been, in its turn, used as material for pantomime libretti. [803] Augustine intimates that most of his listeners would recognise an episode from the *Aeneid* not from having read the text, but from seeing it performed.[804] In much the same way, it is possible that Achilles Tatius' readers could have been as well or better acquainted with contemporary performance versions of the 'Tereus and Philomela' story than with the text of Sophocles or Ovid.

There are several moments in Clitophon's *ekphrasis* and his explanation that could be reminiscent of the dynamic movements that may have been found in performance. A reader familiar with pantomime may have thought of the dancer's movements in Achilles Tatius' specific description of where the struggling Philomela places her hands. [805] In addition, Prokne is described as nodding in the painting—while *ekphraseis* often refer to dynamic movement, the movement of a nod is difficult to express in a static medium. Libanius mentions that audiences leaving the theater would discuss the placement of the feet, the flow of the hands and the suitability of head movements (θέσιν ποδῶν, φορὰν

[801] Tilg (2010: 288-291), Montiglio (2011: 9).
[802] Galinsky (1975: 68), Galinsky (1996: 265-266), Ingleheart (2008: 209-210), Lada-Richards (2013: esp. 115, 121).
[803] Lada-Richards (2013).
[804] Augustine *Sermones* 241.5= *PL* 38,1135-6. Panayotakis (2008: 196).
[805] Lucian, *De Salt*. 64, 63, 69; Cassiodorus *Var*. 4.51.9.

χειρῶν, νευμάτων ἃ διαβάλλεις εὐαρμοστίαν).[806] It is possible that Prokne's nod shows interference with pantomime's portrayal of women (ἐνενεύκει, 5.3.5). Nodding seems to have been a strong feature of female impersonation. Libanius mentions 'nods like those of women' (γυναικείων νευμάτων), and the description of the Venus in Apuleius' Judgement of Paris pantomime includes her nodding head (*annutante capite*).[807]

Clitophon's double narrative contains language and imagery reminiscent of pantomime, which could be evidence of pantomime interference. In addition, the tales share a structural similarity to pantomime. A pantomime audience could have (at least) double exposure to a story portrayed by a dancer—when a herald prefaced the performance with an explanation or a chorus sang the story as an accompaniment to the dance. Clitophon's ekphrasis and explanation provide a similar double exposure to the reader. A pantomime performance of the Philomela story, with a similarly layered narrative and the myth's unique referentiality to the art of the pantomime, could be 'good to think with' in terms of Clitophon's telling of the tale.[808] The double narrative is referential in that Clitophon is given the opportunity to perform, both to his listeners and to Leucippe, and Achilles Tatius is able to present it all to his readers. Although knowledge of pantomime is not essential to enjoy the episode, it does enrich a reading of the text.

Chariclea and Theagenes in Memphis

Arsake, the wife of the satrap of Memphis Oroondates, falls in love with Theagenes and invites the young pair to take shelter in the palace. In a passage

[806] Libanius, *Or*. 64.57. Webb (2008: 69).
[807] Libanius, *Or*. 64.62; Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* 10.32. Webb (2008: 78).
[808] Lada-Richards (2008).

above, Arsake was 'swelling with anger and not without jealousy at the spectacle of Chariclea' (διοιδουμένη καὶ οὐκ ἄνευ ζηλοτυπίας ἤδη τὴν Χαρίκλειαν θεωμένη, 7.7.7). The term ζηλοτυπία has theatrical connotations.[809] Arsake's love pangs over Theagenes, which include restlessness and insomnia (7.9.2-3), are in keeping with the literary tradition of men and women in love.[810] Morgan suggests that her state calls to mind Achilles' grief for Patroklos (*Iliad* 24.4ff),[811] but one could also look to Phaedra's illness in Euripides' *Hippolytus* or Seneca's *Phaedra.* The support she finds in her servant woman Kybele also recalls the Phaedra performance tradition. The story of Phaedra could be found on the pantomime stage.[812] Love stories were staples of the pantomime, and nurses have a pivotal role as go-betweens in many of them. One such story is that of Myrrha, also called Zmyrna, who is the subject of both pantomime and one of the most famous neoteric poems, Cinna's *Zmyrna*, which survives only in fragments.[813] In Ovid's epyllion-style telling of the story in his *Metamorphoses*, Myrrha's nurse serves as her confidante and go-between.[814]

Kybele speaks to Theagenes and Chariclea and asks for their story. Even Theagenes realises the meaning of Arsake's interest in him, picking up on the way that she had stared at him (7.12.7). Chariclea cues him to present the pair as siblings by whispering 'remember your sister in whatever you say' (τῆς ἀδελφῆς…μέμνησο ἐφ' οἷς ἂν λέγῃς, 7.12.7). Chariclea prompts Theagenes much in the way that Calasiris had previously prompted her. Theagenes complies and delivers his first original performance. He provides a short, spurious

[809] Fantham (1980).
[810] Examples include Dido in *Aeneid* 4 and the Latin love elegists.
[811] Morgan (1989b: 496 n 173).
[812] Lucian, *De Salt.* 2.
[813] Lucian, *De Salt.* 58.
[814] Ovid, *Met.* 10.382.

explanation of their circumstances (they are siblings searching for their parents, who were kidnapped by pirates). He suggests that the greatest kindness Arsake could offer them is to let them live in privacy and peace (7.13.1-2). Compared to Chariclea's earlier speech, in which she also claimed they were siblings, Theagenes' story is shorter and less complicated. While Chariclea's speech won the heart of her captor, Theagenes' effort does not result in achieving his wish for them to be left alone. His speech is neither as elaborate nor as successful as Chariclea's. He does not share her sophistic style or ability to engage and convince his audience.

When they are left alone, the pair weep over their fate. Chariclea begins a speech that resembles a tragic lament.

> «Ὦ τὸν Καλάσιριν» ἀνεκάλει κωκύουσα, «τὸ γὰρ χρηστότατον ὄνομα καλεῖν ἀπεστέρημαι πατέρα, τοῦ δαίμονος πανταχόθεν μοι τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς προσηγορίαν περικόψαι φιλονεικήσαντος…ἔνθα γοῦν ἔξεστι καὶ ὡς ἔξεστιν ἀποσπένδω τῶν ἐμαυτῆς δακρύων καὶ ἐπιφέρω χοὰς ἐκ τῶν ἐμαυτῆς πλοκάμων»
>
> 'O Calasiris!' she cried out, wailing, 'I have been robbed of calling anyone Father, the best of names, for the daimon who loves to have his way keeps me from the right to address anyone as my father... where it is possible and how it is possible, I pour you a libation—of my own tears!—and bring you an offering—of my own tresses!' (7.14.5-6)

Theagenes tries to restrain her, 'but she gave out a tragic lament' (ἡ δὲ ἐπετραγῴδει, 7.14.7), a second time. Again, Heliodorus does not attempt to closely follow any single tragic or epic storyline, but rather to use allusions and emotion to build an aura of familiarity and also theatricality.

When Theagenes is told he will have an audience with Arsake, Chariclea advises,

> μὴ ἀντιβαίνειν ἀλλὰ συντρέχειν τὴν πρώτην καὶ ἐνδείκνυσθαι ὡς πάντα πρὸς νοῦν τὸν ἐκείνης ποιήσοντα,

> that he should not resist but go along at first and give the impression that he would do all she had in mind (7.18.3)

The suggestion seems to be taken from Chariclea's playbook: every time she is captured, she responds by going along at first. However, when in front of Arsake, Theagenes fails to follow this advice (7.19.2). Theagenes is not as talented an actor as Chariclea is. His inability to keep up a pretense places the pair in greater danger. Kybele warns Theagenes about 'the wrath of love' (μῆνιν ἐρωτικήν, 7.20.5). Chariclea, in keeping with her own ability to prevaricate, pretends to agree with Kybele, but in private suggests that Theagenes play along with promises. She also warns 'do not slip from the role you play into a shameful deed' (ὅπως μὴ ἐκ μελέτης εἰς τὸ αἰσχρὸν τοῦ ἔργου κατολισθήσῃς, 7.21.4). The noun μελέτη is a theatrical term meaning 'rehearsal'. In Aristophanes' *Ecclesiazusae*, Praxagora brings her 'actresses' together before the Assembly, so that they may rehearse in advance what they will say when the real time of their performance comes (ὅπως προμελετήσωμεν).[815] The verb μελετᾶν also describes sophistic performance—the act of declaiming.[816]

Chariclea's request that Theagenes not betray her in earnest is phrased in a way that brings to mind Plato's argument regarding the danger of *mimêsis*. He voices similar objections to theatre in his discussion of *mimêsis* in the *Republic*, claiming his 'guardians' should not imitate unworthy models with the justification

> ἵνα μὴ ἐκ τῆς μιμήσεως τοῦ εἶναι ἀπολαύσωσιν. ἢ οὐκ ἤσθησαι ὅτι αἱ μιμήσεις, ἐὰν ἐκ νέων πόρρω διατελέσωσιν, εἰς ἔθη τε καὶ φύσιν καθίστανται καὶ κατὰ σῶμα καὶ φωνὰς καὶ κατὰ τὴν διάνοιαν;

[815] Aristophanes, *Ecclesiasousae* 117.
[816] τῆς μελέτης αὐτῷ, 'his declamation' (Philostratus, *VS* 541); δότε μοι σῶμα καὶ μελετήσομαι, 'give me a body and I will declaim' (*VS* 544); τὸν ὑπὲρ μελέτης ἀγῶνα, 'to compete in declamation' (*VS* 601), among others.

> lest from the *mimêsis* they take in the reality of the act. Have you not observed that imitations, if continued from youth far into life, settle down into habits and (second) nature in the body, the speech, and the thought?[817]

Chariclea's anxiety about the difference between appearance and reality suggests a similar jealousy to that exhibited by Theagenes after Chariclea's previous performances. However, where Theagenes was taken in by her performances, Chariclea warns him against being taken in by his own. Since Chariclea is one of the most frequent performers in the novel, her specific concern about the nature of *mimêsis* suggests Heliodorus' intense and intellectual engagement with what it means to perform and with the moral implications of performance. Her awareness of the dangers inherent in performance is contrasted with Theagenes' even stronger feelings. He claims 'to speak immoral words is the same as to commit immoral acts' (ποιεῖν γὰρ τὰ αἰσχρὰ καὶ λέγειν ὁμοίως ἀπρεπές, 7.21.5). His qualms are similar to Neoptolemus' reluctance to playact in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*. The youth confesses, 'when I hear of a plan that gives me pain… I shrink from acting upon it' (ἐγὼ μὲν οὓς ἂν τῶν λόγων ἀλγῶ κλύων … τούσδε καὶ πράσσειν στυγῶ).[818] Chariclea and Theagenes' brief exchange reveals two different viewpoints regarding performance: that it contains a danger that can be withstood, or that it is immoral in itself. Libanius defends against the latter point of view. He argues that a performer who is morally upright can remain virtuous even while impersonating morally degraded characters, but if it is in the performer's nature to be corrupt, then he will be so in any circumstance,

[817] Plato, *Republic* 3.395c-d.
[818] Sophocles, *Philoctetes* 86-7. Falkner (1998), Ringer (1998), Lada-Richards (2009b).

whatever his profession.[819] Chariclea and Theagenes enter into the same debate that preoccupied Plato, Libanius, Lucian and church fathers.

When Theagenes refuses Arsake's advances and reveals his true relationship to Chariclea, Kybele convinces the jealous Arsake to put Theagenes in chains. Theagenes, as a prisoner of war, is technically a slave, as Arsake reminds him. Her treatment of her 'slave' in reaction to his rebuff is similar to the actions of the 'Jealous Mistress' character in mime, as found in Herodas' fifth mimiamb and the *Moicheutria* from P.Oxy 413.[820] In both, a mistress punishes a slave for romantic unfaithfulness.[821] In the *Moicheutria*, the mistress orders the slave and his lover to be killed, while in Herodas the unfaithful slave is beaten and chained.

The mistress in the *Moicheutria* also attempts to poison her husband.[822] At the end of the script, it appears that the mistress has been betrayed—her husband survives and the slaves as well. In Heliodorus, Kybele suggests to Arsake that Chariclea be poisoned in order to conquer Theagenes' fidelity (8.7.2). Unfortunately for the old woman, the poisoned cup was put into the wrong hands—her own. Poison and poisoning may also have been staples of certain mime genres. Although there is no one-to-one correspondence with Herodas' fifth mimiamb or the *Moicheutria*, the actions in the novel resemble elements found in both texts. Heliodorus may be drawing from the same tradition, particularly the elaborate version found in P.Oxy 413. Theagenes suffers at the hands of a jealous mistress who also menaces his lover. As in the *Moicheutria*, there is a twist of fate regarding poison. In addition to mime, pantomime may

[819] Libanius, *Or*. 64.43.
[820] See chapter six.
[821] For more on Herodas 5, see Konstan (1988) and Zanker (2009).
[822] For recent studies of the *Moicheutria,* see Andreassi (1997), (2000), (2001).

have had its share of poisons. In Ovid's version of the Myrrha tale, the nurse claims she knows someone who can cure passion with charms and herbs (*seu furor est, habeo quae carmine sanet et herbis*).[823]

Heliodorus, in typical fashion, continues the story with further twists. Kybele accuses Chariclea as she lies dying, and Chariclea is put on trial for her murder. Heliodorus does not spend a great deal of time on the trial, noting that Arsake wept during the proceedings and 'was a damning accuser' (ἡ μὲν ἦν πικροτάτη κατήγορος, 8.9.7). Chariclea, in turn, confesses to the crime. Arsake's performance at the trial may recall Demainete's weeping at Cnemon's trial. Chariclea's admission of guilt resembles Chaereas' genuine self-condemnation in Chariton or Clitophon's similar false confession in Achilles Tatius. Although her trial is passed over quickly, her punishment is described in detail. She is sentenced to burn at the stake. Her execution becomes a spectacle,

> κήρυκος ὅτι ἐπὶ φαρμάκοις εἰς πυρὰν ἄγοιτο συνεχὲς ἐκβοῶντος, πολλοῦ καὶ ἄλλου πλήθους ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ἐπακολουθήσαντος
>
> a crier was proclaiming that she was being led to burn as a poisoner, and a large crowd of other people from the city followed after. (8.9.10)

When Chariclea steps onto the pyre, the flames do not burn her but instead make her look more beautiful, 'like a bride in a chamber of flame' (οἷον ἐν πυρίνῳ θαλάμῳ νυμφευομένην, 8.9.13). Chariclea's miraculous preservation reads like a martyr narrative in which the faithful Christian is not harmed by the method meant for execution, such as flames.[824] Chariclea, pure and pious, prays and is saved from the flames.[825] Martyr stories were circulated as popular narratives.

[823] Ovid, *Met.* 10. 397.
[824] Andújar (2012) argues that Heliodorus draws on 2nd century martyr narratives, specifically the *Acts of Paul and Thekla*.
[825] Chariclea and Theagenes later attribute the miracle not to the gods, but to her pantarbe—her ring.

Christian practices were often parodied in mime, and conversely there are martyr stories in which mimes who mocked Christians onstage convert to Christianity and become martyrs themselves.[826] Even without an allusion to martyrdom, Chariclea's execution is characterised as an entertainment. A crowd gathers to watch, and responds to the miracle. Execution as entertainment may place Chariclea's execution within the realm of the Roman 'fatal charades', along the lines of Theron's punishment in Chariton.[827]

Conclusion

These episodes show the wide variety of ways in which subliterary interference enriches a reader's experience of the novels. The *Laureolus* mime provides a context for Chariton's extended treatment of Theron, just as mime and subliterary humour may add depth to the story of Leucippe's shaved head and help argue for the novel's possible reception in a barbershop mime. The fascinating genre of pantomime is often difficult to identify and distinguish from other performance influences, but a recognition of pantomime themes and gestures provides additional interpretive material in a reading of Clitophon's Tereus tale. Theagenes and Chariclea's adventures in Memphis recall Cnemon's misadventures with mime earlier in the novel and their opinions regarding the morality of acting add a self-conscious cast to their roles within the narrative.

[826] For example, Genesius. For mime martyrs, see Webb (2008: 7-8, 125, 143-46,158, 160).
[827] Coleman (1990).

Conclusion

It is tempting to claim that the novels straddled a high/low culture divide, but it is perhaps better to recognise that this divide was hardly a chasm. Performance culture was an aspect of daily life, and just as few people today can escape becoming conversant in popular television programmes whether or not they tune in every week to watch *Mad Men* or *Downton Abbey*, performance was in the air and it is likely the novelists breathed it in. The novels appear saturated with a theatricality indebted not just to canonical dramatic literature but also to the live performance culture of the period. Although we cannot reconstruct ancient performances based on episodes in the novels, they do begin to offer a flavour of the culture of the period, in its rich variety, ranging from the heights of erudition to more earthly sexual escapades. At the beginning of this thesis, I provided an overview of the contemporary performance milieu and illustrated how a variety of genres shared audiences as well as material. Although the written record has left us little with which to reconstruct their performances, it is clear that mime and especially pantomime captivated ancient audiences, as orations both defending and excoriating the theatre attest. As is often the case in archaeology, we are left not with the objects themselves, only the impressions they left behind.

Some of these impressions are found in the theatricality of the novels. Chariton, in his possible engagement with peripatetic theory and mention of *catharsis*, begins what can be read as a formulation of novel poetics, indebted to the tragic formula. Even if the novelists were not consciously interacting with peripatetic tragic poetics, there is an indication of a certain sense that contains within the aims of the novels a certain rejection of or challenge to 'tragedy'—or

so a reader could believe. The authors' employment of theatrical terms also suggests a practical knowledge of the theatre that could be activated by a mindful reader.

This awareness of performance is also evidenced in the frequent audience/performer dynamic found in the novels. The protagonists do not take to a literal stage, but they are often the subject of an audience's attention. The characters have varying levels of awareness of their roles as entertainers or performers, ranging from unaware to hyper-aware. Calasiris is perhaps the novels' most famous performer—he captivates Cnemon with his storytelling, cozens Charicles and orchestrates the 'kidnapping' that sets Chariclea and Theagenes on their adventures. While Calasiris employs sophisticated rhetorical techniques (at the encouragement and direction of Cnemon), some of his most outrageous and memorable performances have more in common with subliterary genres. His 'Egyptian magic' act seems closer to mime or street performance. The beggar disguise, while evocative of the *Odyssey* and tragic recognition scenes, can easily be read as inhabiting the realm of burlesque or parody. In the Heliodorus version of *Seven against Thebes*, the brothers *and* the father live—a happy ending in defiance of tragic plots. Knowledge of tragedy is not always a marker of intelligence or perspicacity. The educated Delphian priest Charicles can compare his previous woes to tragedy, but cannot read the subliterary signs that Calasiris is playing him for a fool. Similar lack of awareness is found in Cnemon, who sees only tragedy in a situation closely in line with the adulterous antics of mime. Their adherence to 'high-culture' allusions may blind them to subliterary situations.

Calasiris meets his equal in Chariclea, who proves to be just as innovative and versatile a performer. She sees through his charlatan act from the first and quickly becomes a willing co-star. Calasiris himself marvels at her adroitness and ability to turn a situation to her advantage, traits that she retains through the end of the novel. Like Calasiris, her performances are not all clearly related to dramatic literature. Her *ex tempore* speaking resembles that of a declaimer, while her willingness to improvise and manipulate her clothing and belongings has more in common with the off-the-cuff elements of mime or the simple, clever costumes changes of pantomime. Chariclea's conscious use of performance is articulated in her advice to Theagenes, urging him to play along with Arsake to their advantage. His response and subsequent failure to play false is a direct contrast to Chariclea's performance ethics. Theagenes dares not tread on the slippery slope of performance, while Chariclea does so with confidence in her own integrity.

Leucippe and Clitophon provide a different way to view performance in the novels. Clitophon is intensely aware of life as a stage, on which he can perform and also be entertained. Leucippe in particular is a feast for his eyes, not only during their first dinner together but throughout the novel. When Leucippe is in mortal danger, Clitophon is there to witness and describe in lurid detail. He begs for details of the one death he does not witness. When she is imprisoned by Thersander, Clitophon still provides an eyewitness account for his listener, which includes Leucippe's passionate speech inviting her captor to watch her suffer under various torments. This entreaty could very well be coloured by Clitophon's voracious voyeuristic appetite. Leucippe's deaths, so lavishly retold by Clitophon, are similar to the subliterary violence of mime or the amphitheatre.

One specific genre that intersects with all three novels is adultery mime. In Chariton, a standard adultery mime plot is subverted by the fidelity of the supposed adulteress, Callirhoe. Chaereas plays the buffoon to perfection, falling into the role of jealous husband and reading performance as reality. The Acragantine skillfully plans and directs the set of performances that lead to Chaereas' downfall. It will take the remainder of the novel for Chaereas to develop the skills to influence people as successfully. While the adultery episode in Chariton is a rather straightforward interpretation of the adultery mime theme, with just one major inversion, the adultery scenarios in Achilles Tatius are more convoluted, leading to a double, even triple, adultery situation involving two couples. Melite and Thersander both take on the role of eager adulterer, while Thersander and Leucippe take on the cuckold's role. The adultery elements are spread out, eventually culminating in a trial, incorporating a profusion of subliterary and theatrical elements beyond merely mime. The combination and contrast of genres create an especially vibrant and entertaining set of scenes, such as Leucippe's seeking sanctuary in a temple being followed by Clitophon having his nose bloodied by the bellicose Thersander. Similar genre clashing occurs in Heliodorus' interactions with adultery mime. Cnemon and his father both attempt to interrupt adulterous proceedings, and in Chariton, do not find a lover. In an inversion of the adultery mime theme of putting an adulterous pair on trial, it is Cnemon, the buffoon, who finds himself in front of a jury. Cnemon reads his predicament as a tragedy, which adds additional humour to the mimic elements. Later in the novel, the spectre of adultery mime surfaces again, in Arsake's machinations. The episodes in Memphis also draw on other subliterary elements, including poison and intrigue from mime and pantomime.

Echoes of the subliterary resound in the novels, able to be picked up by attentive readers. The evidence may be scarce, but what traces remain of subliterary performance can be used to expand the possibilities of the potential intertexts for the novels. Chariton's Theron shares similarities with *Laureolus*, and the staged violence of that mime resembles Leucippe's deaths. Pantomime becomes an intriguing intertext in Achilles Tatius. The character of Clinias may in fact refer directly to pantomime in his condemnation of women, and the imagery of pantomime performance adds an additional layer to Clitophon's speeches about Philomela.

As this study has shown, there are yet insights to be gained from reading Greek novels with live performance contexts in mind. The novelists use theatricality to help a reader bring the text to life in a performance for the mind's eye. The polyphony of novels, especially the interweaving of high and low culture, allows a reader to make the most out of his own cultural preferences. Readers with an interest in the theatre would be able to recognise cues and embellish their visualisations of the novels using their knowledge of contemporary performance. These allusions would help bring the novels to life, adding to a reader's pleasure.

Novel Texts and Commentary

Garnaud, J-P. (ed.) (1991), *Achille Tatius D'Alexandre: Le roman de Leucippé et Clitophon*, (Paris: Belles Lettres).

Gaselee, S. (ed.) (1984), *Achilles Tatius*, Rev. ed., (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press).

Goold, G. P. (ed.) (1995), *Chariton*, (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press).

Molinié, G. (ed.) (1979), *Chariton: Le roman de Chairéas et Callirhoé*, (Paris: Belles Lettres).

O'Sullivan, J. (1980), *A Lexicon to Achilles Tatius*, (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter).

Rattenbury, R. M. and Lumb, T. W. (ed.) (1960), *Héliodore: Les Ethiopiques, Théagene et Chariclée*, (Paris: Budé).

Vilborg, E. (ed.) (1955), *Achilles Tatius. Leucippe and Clitophon*, (Stockholm, Göteburg and Uppsala: Almquist & Wiksell).
_____. (1962), *Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Clitophon: A Commentary*, (Stockholm, Göteburg and Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell).

Bibliography

Allen, G. (2011), *Intertextuality* (2nd ed.), (Abingdon and New York: Routledge).

Anderson, G. (1982), *Eros Sophistes: Ancient Novelists at Play*, (Chico: Scholars Press).
_____. (1984), *Ancient Fiction: The Novel in the Graeco-Roman World*, (London and Sydney: Croom Helm).
_____. (1993), *The Second Sophistic*, (London and New York: Routledge).
_____. (1996), 'Popular and Sophisticated in the Ancient Novel', in G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, (Leiden: Brill) 107-113.

Andreassi, M. (1997), 'Osmosis and contiguity between "low" and "high" literature: Moicheutria and Apuleius', *GCN* 8: 1–21.
_____. (2000), 'La figura del *malakos* nel mimo della *Moicheutria*', *Hermes* 128: 320-326.
_____. (2001), *Mimi greci in Egitto: Charition e Moicheutria*, (Bari: Palomar).

Andújar, R. (2012), 'Charicleia the Martyr: Heliodorus and Early Christian Narrative,' in M. P. Futre Pinheiro, J. Perkins, R. Pervo (edd.), *The Ancient Novel and the Early Christian and Jewish Narrative: Fictional , Ancient*

Narrative Supplementum 16, (Groningen: Barkhuis and Groningen University Library), 139-152.

Asmis, E. (1986), '*Psychagogia* in Plato's Phaedrus', *Illinois Studies in Classical Philology* 11: 153-172.

Athanassaki, L. and Bowie, E. (edd.) (2011), *Archaic and Classical Choral Song: Performance, Politics and Dissemination*, *Trends in Classics* 10, (Berlin: De Gruyter).

Balot, R. K. (1998), 'Foucault, Chariton and the masculine self', *Helios* 25: 139-62.

Bakhtin, M. (1971), *The Dialogic Imagination* (M. Holquist, ed.; C. Emerson & M. Holquist, trans.), (Austin: University of Texas Press).

Barish, J. (1981), *The Antitheatrical Prejudice* (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Barrett, J. (2002), *Staged Narrative: Poetics and the Messenger in Greek Tragedy*, (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Bartsch, S. (1989), *Decoding the Ancient Novel*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Bastet, F. L. (1974), 'Fabularum dispositas explicationes', *Bulletin Antieke Beschaving* 49: 206-40.

Beacham, R. (1991), *The Roman Theatre and its Audience*, (London: Routledge).

Beer, G. (1977), '"Coming Wonders": uses of theatre in the Victorian novel', in M. Anton and R. Williams (edd.), *English Drama: Forms and Development*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 164-185.

Belfiore, E. (1985), 'Pleasure, Tragedy and Aristotelian Psychology', *CQ* 36.2: 349-61.

Bentley, G. G. (2013), 'An Ancient Othello in Chariton's *Callirhoe*', in K. Mendocino and B. Wasihun (edd.), *Playing False: Representations of Betrayal*, (Oxford: Peter Lang) 285-312.

Bergmann B. (1999), 'Introduction: The Art of Ancient Spectacle', in B. Bergmann and C. Kondoleon (edd.), *The Art of Ancient Spectacle (Studies in the History of Art 56), Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts. Symposium Papers XXXIV*, (New Haven and London: National Gallery of Art Washington and Yale University Press) 9-35.

Berry, D. H. and Heath, M. (1997), 'Oratory and Declamation', in S. Porter (ed.), *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period: 330 B.C.-A.D. 400*, (Leiden: Brill) 393-420.

Bieber, M. (1961), *The History of the Greek and Roman Theater*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Billault, A. (1981), 'Aspects du roman de Chariton', *IL* 33: 205-11.
_____. (1989), 'De l'histoire au roman. Hermocrate de Syracuse', *REG* 102: 540-548.
_____. (1996), 'Characterization in the Ancient Novel', in G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, (Leiden: Brill), 115-129.

Birchall, J. (1996), 'The Lament as a Rhetorical Feature in the Greek Novel', *GCN* 7: 1-17.

Bonaria, M. (1955-56), *Mimorum romanorum fragmenta*, 2 vols., (Genoa: Istituto di filologia classica).
_____. (1959), 'Dinastie di pantomimi latini', *Maia* 11: 224-242.
_____. (1965), *Romani Mimi*, (Rome: In Aedibus Athenaei).

Borg, B. E. (ed.) (2004), *Paideia: The World of the Second Sophistic*, (Berlin: de Gruyter).

Borgogno, A. (1971), 'Menandro in Caritone', *RFIC* 99: 257-63.

Bornecque, H. (1902), *Les déclamations et les déclamateurs d'après Sénèque le père* (= Travaux et mémoires de l'Université de Lille N.S. 1.1.), (Lille: Université de Lille).

Borza, E. N. (1995), *Makedonika*, (Claremont: Regina Books).

Bowersock, G. W. (1969), *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
_____. (1995), *Martyrdom and Rome*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Bowie, E. (1970), 'Greeks and their Past in the Second Sophistic', *P&P* 46: 3-41.
_____. (1982), 'The Importance of Sophists', *YCS* 27: 29-59.
_____. (1986), 'Early Greek elegy, symposium and public festival', *JHS* 106: 13-35.
_____. (1985), 'The Greek Novel', in P.E. Easterling and B.M. W. Knox (edd.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature I: Greek Literature I*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 683-699.
_____. (1990a), 'Who Read the Greek Novels?', in J. Tatum and G.M. Vernazza (edd.), *The Ancient Novel: Classical Paradigms and Modern Perspectives*, (Hanover: Dartmouth College) 150-151.

_____. (1990b), '*Miles ludens?* The problem of martial exhortation in early Greek elegy', in O. Murray (ed.) *Sympotica. A symposium on the symposium,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 221-9.
_____ and Harrison, S. J. (1993), 'The Romance of the Novel', *JRS* 83: 159-78.
_____. (1994), 'The Readership of Greek Novels in the Ancient World', in J. Tatum (ed.), *The Search for the Ancient Novel,* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press) 435-459.
_____. (1995), 'Names and a Gem: Aspects of Allusion in Heliodorus' Aethiopica', in D. Innes, H. Hine, and C. Pelling (edd.), *Ethics and Rhetoric: Classical Essays for Donald Russell on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press) 269–80.
_____. (1998), 'Phoenician games in Heliodorus' *Aithiopika*', in R. Hunter (ed.) *Studies in Heliodorus,* (Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society) 1-18.
_____. (2000), 'Literature and Sophistic', *The Cambridge Ancient History*^{2}, 11, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 898-921.
_____. (2002), 'The Chronology of the Earlier Greek Novels since B.E. Perry: Revisions and Precisions', *Ancient Narrative* 2: 47–63.
_____. (2008), 'Literary milieux', in T. Whitmarsh (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman Novel,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 17-38.
_____ and Elsner, J. (edd.) (2009), *Philostratus,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
_____. (2013), 'Milesian Tales', in T. Whitmarsh and S. Thomson (edd.), *The Romance between Greece and the East,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 243-260.

Brethes, R. (2007a) *De l'idéalisme au réalisme: une étude du comique dans le roman grec,* (Salerno: Helios).
_____. (2007b), 'Who Knows What? The Access to Knowledge in Ancient Novels: the Strange Cases of Chariton and Apuleius', in M. Paschalis, S. Frangoulidis, S. Harrison and M. Zimmerman (edd.), *The Greek and Roman Novel: Parallel Readings*, *Ancient Narrative Supplementum* 8, (Groningen: Barkhuis and Groningen University Library) 171-192.

Bühler, W. (1976), 'Das Element des Visuellen in der Eingangsszene von Heliodors Aithiopika', *Wiener Studien* 89: 177-185.

Burrell, B. (2005), 'Iphigeneia in Philadelphia', *CA* 24: 223-56.

Burkert, W. (1983), *Homo Necans: The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth* (P. Bing, trans.), (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press).

Burns, E. (1972), *Theatricality,* (New York: Harper and Row).

Bussels, S. (2012), *The Animated Image: Roman theory on naturalism, vividness and divine power,* (Munich and Leiden: Akademie Verlag and Leiden University Press).

Cameron, A. (1991), *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: the Development of Christian Discourse*, Sather Classical Lectures (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Caputo, G. (1959), *Il teatro di Sabratha e l'architettura teatrale Africana*, (Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider).

Carr, J. F. (1989), 'Dickens' Theatre of Self-Knowledge' in C.H. MacKay (ed.), *Dramatic Dickens*, (Eastleigh and London: Palgrave Macmillan) 27-44.

Cave, T. (2001), 'The Afterlife of the *Poetics*', in Ø. Anderson and J. Haarberg (edd.), *Making Sense of Aristotle*, (London: Duckworth) 197-217.

Cazzaniga, I. (1958) 'Note marginali al Papiro Berlinese 13927 (V-VI sec. d. C.): un inventario di oggetti necessary per rappresentazioni sceniche', *Studi Classici e Orientali* 7: 7-19.

Chaniotis, A. (1997), 'Theatricality and Theater: Staging public life in the Hellenistic World', *Pallas* 47: 219-59.

Charitonidis, S., Kahil, L. and Ginouvès, R. (1970), *Les Mosaïques de la Maison du Ménandre à Mytilène*, (Bern: Antike Kunst).

Chew, K. (2003), 'The Representation of Violence in the Greek Novels and Martyr Accounts', in S. Panayotakis, M. Zimmerman and W. Keulen (edd.), *The Ancient Novel and Beyond*, (Leiden and Boston: Brill) 129-141.

Cicu, L. (1992), 'Componere mimum (Petr. *Sat*. 117, 4)', *Sandalion* 15: 103-141.

Coleman, K. M. (1990), 'Fatal Charades: Roman Executions Staged as Mythological Enactments', *JRS* 80: 44-73.

Connolly, J. (2001), 'Reclaiming the Theatrical in the Second Sophistic', *Helios* 28: 75-96.

Connors, C. (2008), 'Politics and Spectacles', in T. Whitmarsh (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman Novel*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 162-181.

Corbato, C. (1947), 'L'iscrizione sepolcrale di una mima di Aquileia romana', *Dioniso* 10: 188-203.

Couraud-Lalanne , S. (1998), 'Théâtralité et dramatisation rituelle dans le roman grec', *GCN* 9: 1-16.

Cribiore, R. (2001), *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*, (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press).

Csapo, E. and Slater, W. J. (edd.) (1995), *The Context of Ancient Drama*, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press).

Csapo, E. (2010), *Actors and Icons of the Ancient Theater*, (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell).

Cueva, E. P. (2004), *The myths of fiction: studies in the canonical Greek novels* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press).

Cunningham, I. C. (1987), *Herodas, Mimiambi. Cum appendice fragmentorum mimorum papyraceorum,* (Leipzig: Teubner).

Damon, C. (1995), 'Greek Parasites and Roman Patronage', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 97: 181-195.

Daniels, C. B. and Scully, S. (1992), 'Pity, Fear and Catharsis in Aristotle's *Poetics*', *Noûs* 26.2: 204-17.

D'Arms, J. (1999), 'Performing Culture: Roman Spectacle and the Banquets of the Powerful', in B. Bergmann and C. Kondoleon (edd.), *The Art of Ancient Spectacle (Studies in the History of Art 56), Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts. Symposium Papers XXXIV,* (New Haven and London: National Gallery of Art Washington and Yale University Press) 301-319.

Daude, C. (1994), 'La rhétorique de Callirhoé au livre II du roman de Chariton', in B. Pouderon and J. Peigny (edd.), *Discours et Débats dans l'ancien Roman,* (Tours: Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée) 191-216.

Davis, T. C. and T. Postlewait. (2003), *Theatricality*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

de Jong, I. J. F. (1991). *Narrative in Drama: The Art of the Euripidean Messenger-Speech*, (Leiden: E. J. Brill).

de Souza, P. (1999), *Piracy in the Graeco-Roman World*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

De Temmerman, K. (2009), 'Chaereas Revisited. Rhetorical Control in Chariton's 'Ideal' Novel *Callirhoe*', *Classical Quarterly* 59.1:247-262.
_____. (2010), 'How Ideal is the Oldest Ideal Greek Novel?: review S.D. Smith *Greek Identity and the Athenian Past in Chariton*', *Mnemosyne* 63.3: 465-478.

Dentith, S. (1995), *Bakhtinian Thought*, (London and New York: Routledge).

Dickie, M. W. (1991), 'Heliodorus and Plutarch on the Evil Eye', *Classical Philology* 86.1: 17-29.
_____. (2001), *Magic and Magicians in the Greco-Roman World*, (New York: Routledge).

Dickens, C. (1960), *The Speeches of Charles Dickens Literary and Social* (K. J. Fielding, ed.), (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Diels, H. and W. Krantz (edd.) (1952-1956), *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker griechisch und deutsch*, (Berlin: Weidman).

Dobbins, J. J. (2000), 'The Houses of Antioch', in C. Kondoleon (ed.), *Antioch: The Lost Ancient City*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press) 51-62.

Dodge, H. (2010), 'Amusing the Masses: Buildings for Entertainment and Leisure in the Roman World', in D. Potter and D.J. Mattingly (edd.), *Life, Death and Entertainment in the Roman Empire* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press) 229-279.

Doulamis, K. (ed.) (2011a), *Echoing narratives: studies of intertextuality in Greek and Roman prose fiction, Ancient Narrative Supplementum* 13, (Groningen: Barkhuis and Groningen University Library).

_____. (2011b), 'Forensic Oratory and Rhetorical Theory in Chariton Book 5', in K. Doulamis (ed.), *Echoing narratives: studies of intertextuality in Greek and Roman prose fiction, Ancient Narrative Supplementum* 13, (Groningen: Barkhuis and Groningen University Library), 21-48.

_____. (2012), 'All's Well that Ends Well: Storytelling, Predictive Signs, and the Voice of the Author in Chariton's *Callirhoe'*, *Mnemosyne* 65: 18-39.

Dover, K. J. (1968), *Aristophanes: Clouds*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Dowden, K. (1996), 'Heliodorus: Serious Intentions', *The Classical Quarterly* 46.1: 267-285.

Duncan, A. (2006), *Performance and Identity in the Classical World*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Durham, B. (1938), 'Parody in Achilles Tatius', *Classical Philology* 33.1: 1-19.

Dworacki, S. (1996), 'Theatre and Drama in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica'*, *Eos* 54: 355-361.

Easterling, P. (1996), 'Weeping, Witnessing, and the Tragic Audience: Response to Segal', in M. Silk (ed.), *Tragedy and the Tragic* (Oxford: Clarendon Press) 173-81.

_____. (1997), 'From repertoire to canon', in P. Easterling, (ed.) *Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 211-27.

_____ **and Miles, R.** (1999), 'Dramatic Identities: Tragedy in Late Antiquity', in R. Miles (ed.), *Constructing Identities in Late Antiquity*, (New York and London: Routledge) 95-111.

Edwards, C. (2002) 'Acting and self-actualisation in imperial Rome: some death scenes', in P. Easterling and E. Hall (edd.), *Greek and Roman Actors: Aspects of an Ancient Profession,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 377-94.

Edwards, D. (1994), 'Defining the web of power in Asia Minor: The Novelist Chariton and his city Aphrodisias', *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, Vol. 62.3: 699-718.

Elmer, D. F. (2008), 'Intertextuality, Paternity, and the Nile River in the *Aithiopika*', *TAPhA* 138. 2: 411-450.

Else, G. F. (1957), *Aristotle's Poetics: the Argument*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press).

Elsom, H. E. (1992), 'Callirhoe: Displaying the Phallic Woman', in A. Richlin (ed.), *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 212-30.

Eshleman, K. (2012), *The Social World of Intellectuals in the Roman Empire*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Esrock, E. J. (1994), *The Reader's Eye*, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press).

Egger, B. (1994), 'Looking at Chariton's Callirhoe', in J.R. Morgan and R. Stoneman (edd.), *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*, (London and New York: Routledge) 31-48.
_____. (1999), 'Woman as Heroine and Reader', in S. Swain (ed.), *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 108-136.

Falkner, T. (1998), 'Containing tragedy: rhetoric and self-representation in Sophocles' Philoctetes', *Classical Antiquity* 17: 25-58.

Fantham, R. E. (1980), 'ΖΗΛΟΤΥΠΙΑ: Sex, Violence and Literary History', *Phoenix* 40.1: 45-57.
_____. (1989), 'Mime: the Missing Link in Roman Literary History', *Classical World* 82.3: 153-162.
_____. (2001), 'Roman Tragedy and the Teaching of Aristotle's *Poetics*', in Ø. Anderson and J. Haarberg (edd.), *Making Sense of Aristotle,* (London: Duckworth) 109-25.

Feldherr, A. (2010), *Playing Gods. Ovid's Metamorphoses and the Politics of Fiction*, (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press).

Feuillätre, E. (1966), *Études sur* les Ethiopiques *d'Héliodore: contribution à la connaissance du roman grec* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France).

Fowler, D. (1997), 'On the Shoulders of Giants: Intertextuality and Classical Studies', *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 39: 13-34.

Frangoulidis, S. A. (1999), 'Theatre and Spectacle in Apuleius' Tale of the Robber Thrasyleon (Met. 4.13-21)', in B. Zimmermann (ed.), *Griechisch-römische Komödie und Tragödie* III, (Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler) 113-135.

Friedrich, R. (1983), 'ΕΠΕΙΣΟΔΙΟΝ in Drama and Epic', *Hermes* 111: 34-52.

Furley, W. D. and Bremer, J.M. (2001), *Greek Hymns: Selected Songs from the Archaic to the Hellenistic Period,* vol. 1, (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Fusillo, M. (1988), 'Textual Patterns and Narrative Situations in the Greek Novel', *GCN* 1: 17-31.
_____. (1989), *Il romanzo greco: polifonia ed eros*, (Venice: Marsilio).
_____. (1991), *La naissance du roman*, trans. M. Abrioux (Paris: Seuil).
_____. (1994), 'Letteratura d'arte e letteratura di consumo, *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica* 1.3, (Rome: Salerno) 233-73.
_____. (1996), 'Modern critical theories and the ancient novel', in G. Schmeling (ed.) *The Novel in the Ancient World*, (Leiden: Brill) 277-305.
_____. (1999), 'The Conflict of Emotions in the Greek Novel', in S. Swain (ed.), *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 60-82.

Futre Pinheiro, M. (1992), 'Calasiris' Story and its Narrative Significance in Heliodorus' Aethiopica', *GCN* 4: 69-83.

Galinsky, K. (1975), *Ovid's Metamorphoses*, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell).
_____. (1996), *Augustan Culture,* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Gallistl, B. (1995), *Maske und Spiegel Zur Maskenszene des Pompenjaner Mysterienfrieses,* (Georg Olms Verlag: Hildesheim, Zurich and New York).

Garis, R. (1965), *The Dickens Theatre: A Reassessment of the Novels*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Garson, R. W. (1975), 'Notes on Some Homeric Echoes in Heliodorus' Aethiopica', *Acta Classica* 18: 137–40.

Gentili, B. (1979), *Theatrical Performances in the Ancient World*, (Amsterdam and Uithoorn: J.C. Gieben).

Giancotti, F. (1967), *Mimo e Gnome: Studio su Decimo laberio e Publilio Siro,* (Messina and Florence: Biblioteca di cultura contemporanea xcvill).

Gianotti, G. F. (1986), *'Romanzo' e Ideologia. Studi sulle 'Metamorfosi' di Apuleio*, (Napoli: Liguori).
_____. (1996), 'Il mimo letterario tra spettacolo e scuola', in O. Pecere and A. Stramaglia (eds), *La letteratura di consumo nel mondo greco-latino,* (Cassino: Levante) 265-92.

Gilbert, A. H. (1949), 'The Word ΕΠΕΙΣΟΔΙΟΝ in Aristotle's *Poetics*', *AJPh* 70: 56-64.

Glavin, J. (2001), 'Dickens and theatre', in J.O. Jordan (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Charles Dickens*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 189-203.

Gleason, M. (1995), *Making Men*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Golden, L. (1962), 'Catharsis', *TAPA* 93: 51-60.

Goldhill, S. (1995), *Foucault's Virginity: Ancient Erotic Fiction and the History of Sexuality*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
_____. (2001) 'The erotic eye: visual stimulation and cultural conflict', in S. Goldhill (ed.), *Being Greek under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 154-194.
_____. (2007), 'What is Ekphrasis for?', *Classical Review* 102: 1-19.
_____. (2009), 'Rhetoric and the Second Sophistic', in E. Gunderson (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Rhetoric*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 228-241.

Gowers, E. (1993), *The Loaded Table: Representations of Food in Roman Literature*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Green, J.R. (1994), *Theatre in Ancient Greek Society*, (London and New York: Routledge).

García Gual, C. G. (1975), 'Apuntes sobre el mimo y la novela griega', *Anuario de Filología* 1: 33-41.

Gunderson, E. (2000), *Staging Masculinity: The Rhetoric of Performance in the Roman World*, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press).

Gutzwiller, K. (2000.), 'The Tragic Mask of Comedy: Metatheatricality in Menander', *Classical Antiquity* 19: 102-37.

Hägg, T. (1971), *Narrative Technique in Ancient Greek Romances*, (Stockholm: Paul Aströms Förlag).
_____. (1972), 'Some technical aspects of the characterization in Chariton's romance', in *Studi classici in onore di Quintino Cataudella*, vol. 2 (Catania: Università di Catania, Facoltà di lettere e filosofia) 545-556.
_____. (1983), *The Novel in Antiquity*, (Berkeley: University of California Press).
_____. (1994), 'Orality, literacy and the "readership" of the early Greek novel', in R. Eriksen (ed.), *Contexts of the Pre-Novel Narrative: The European Tradition*, (Berlin and New York) 47-81.
_____. (1999), '*Callirhoe* and *Parthenope*: The Historical Novel', in S. Swain (ed.) *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 137-162.

_____ and Utas, B. (2003), *The Virgin and Her Lover: Fragments of an Ancient Greek Novel and a Persian Epic Poem,* (Leiden and Boston: Brill).
_____. (2004), *Parthenope: Studies in Ancient Greek Fiction,* (Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press).

Hall, E. (1996), 'Is there a *Polis* in Aristotle's *Poetics*?', in M. S. Silk (ed.), *Tragedy and the Tragic,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 295-309.
_____. (1997), 'Theatrical Archaeology', *American Journal of Archaeology* 101: 154-58.
_____. (1999), 'Actor's Song in Tragedy', in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (edd.), *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 96-122.
_____. (2002), 'The singing actors of antiquity', in P. Easterling and E. Hall (edd.), *Greek and Roman Actors: Aspects of an Ancient Profession,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 3-38.
_____. (2004), 'Towards a Theory of Performance Reception', *Arion* 12.1: 51-89.
_____. (2006), *The Theatrical Cast of Athens*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
_____. (2007), 'Greek Tragedy 430-380 BC', in R. Osborne (ed.), *Debating the Athenian Cultural Revolution: Art, Literature, Philosophy, and Politics 430-380 BC,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 264-287.
_____. (2008a), 'Introduction: Pantomime, a Lost Chord of Ancient Culture', in E. Hall and R. Wyles (edd.) *New Directions in Ancient Pantomime* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 1-40.
_____. (2008b), 'Is the 'Barcelona *Alcestis*' a Latin Pantomime libretto?', in E. Hall and R. Wyles (edd.), *New Directions in Ancient Pantomime,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 258-282.
_____. (2010), 'Iphigenia in Oxyrhynchus and India', in S. Tsitsiridis (ed.), *Parachoregema. Studies on Ancient Theatre in Honour of Professor Gregory M. Sifakis,* (Heraklion: Crete University Press) 393- 417.
_____. (2013a), *Adventures with Iphigenia in Tauris: A Cultural History of Euripides' Black Sea Tragedy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
_____. (2013b), 'Rhetorical Actors and Other Versatile Hellenistic Vocalists', in C. Kremmydas and K. Tempest (edd.), *Hellenistic Oratory: Continuity and Change,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 109-36.
_____. (2013c), 'Pantomime: Visualising Myth in the Roman Empire', in G. W. M. Harrison and V. Liapis (edd.), *Performance in Greek and Roman Theatre,* (Leiden and Boston: Brill) 451-73.

Halliwell, S. (1998), *Aristotle's Poetics*, (London: Duckworth).

Halporn, J. W. (1996), 'Review: G.W. Bowersock, *Martyrdom and Rome*', *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 96.04.28.

Hardie, P. (1998), 'A Reading of Heliodorus, Aithiopika 3.4.1–5.2', in R. Hunter (ed.), *Studies in Heliodorus*, (Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society) 1998 19-39.

Harrison, S. J. (2006), 'Literary Texture in the Adultery-Tales of Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* Book 9' in R. Nauta (ed.), *Desultoria Scientia: genre in Apuleius' Metamorphoses and related texts*, (Leuven: Peeters) 19-31.
_____. (2007), *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Havelock, E. (1963), *Preface to Plato*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press).

Haynes, K. (2003), *Fashioning the Feminine in the Greek Novel*, (London and New York: Routledge).

Heath, M. (1987), *The Poetics of Greek Tragedy*, (London: Duckworth).
_____. (2001), 'Aristotle and the Pleasures of Tragedy', in Ø. Anderson and J. Haarberg (edd.), *Making Sense of Aristotle*, (London: Duckworth) 7-23.

Hefti, V. L. (1950), *Zur Erzälungstechnik in Heliodors Aethiopica*, (Vienna: Holzhausen).

Heiserman, A. (1977), *The Novel before the Novel*, (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press).

Henrichs, A. (2010), 'Missing Pages: Papyrology, Genre, and the Greek Novel', in D. Obbink and R. Rutherford (edd.), *Culture in Pieces: Essays on Ancient Texts in Honour of Peter Parsons*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 302-322.

Hentze, C. (1905), 'Die Chorreden in den homerischen Epen', *Philologus* 18: 254-68.

Hilton, J. (1998), 'An Ethiopian Paradox: Heliodorus, *Aithiopika* 4.8', in R. Hunter (ed.), *Studies in Heliodorus*, (Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society) 40-59.

Hinds, S. (1998), *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Hirschberger, M. (2001), 'Epos und Tragodie in Charitons *Kallirhoe*', *WJA* 25:157-86.

Hock, R.F. (1997), 'The Rhetoric of Romance', in S. Porter (ed.), *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period: 330 B.C.-A.D. 400*, (Leiden: Brill) 445-465.

Holquist, M. (1990), *Dialogism: Bakhtin and his World*, (London and New York: Routledge).

Holzberg, N. (1995), *The Ancient Novel: An Introduction*, (London and New York: Routledge).

Hooff, A. J. L. (1988), 'Ancient Robbers: Reflections Behind the Facts', *AncSoc* 19: 105-24.

Hopwood, K. (1998), '"All that may become a man": the bandit in the ancient novel', in L. Foxhall and J. Salmon (edd.), *When Men Were Men: Masculinity, power and identity in classical antiquity*, (London and New York: Routledge) 195-204.

Hunt, Y. (2008), "Roman Pantomime Libretti and their Greek Themes: the Role of Augustus in the Romanization of the Classics", in E. Hall and R. Wyles (edd.), *New Directions in Ancient Pantomime,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 169-84.

Hunter, R. L. (1985), *The New Comedy of Greece & Rome*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
_____. (1994), 'History and historicity in the romance of Chariton', *ANRW* II.37.2: 1055-86.
_____. (ed.) (1998a), *Studies in Heliodorus*, (Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society).
_____. (1998b), 'The *Aithiopika* of Heliodorus: Beyond Interpretation?', in R. Hunter (ed.), *Studies in Heliodorus*, (Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society) 40-59.
_____. (2002), '"Acting down": the ideology of Hellenistic performance', in P. Easterling and E. Hall (edd.), *Greek and Roman Actors: Aspects of an Ancient Profession*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 189-206.
_____. (2008), 'Ancient Readers', in T. Whitmarsh (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman Novel*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 261-271.
_____. (2009), 'The Curious Incident…: *polypragmosyne* and the Ancient Novel', in M. Paschalis, S. Panayotakis and G. Schmeling (edd.), *Readers and Writers in the Ancient Novel, Ancient Narrative Supplementum* 12, (Groningen: Barkhuis and Groningen University Library) 51-63.

Hunter, V. (1986), 'Thucydides, Gorgias, and Mass Psychology', *Hermes* 114: 412-29.

Huskinson, J. (2002-3), 'Theatre, Performance and Theatricality in Some Mosaic Pavements from Antioch', *BICS* 46: 131-65.

Ingleheart, J. (2008), 'Et mea sunt popolo saltata poemata saepe (Tristia 2.519): Ovid and Pantomime', in E. Hall and R. Wyles (edd.), *New Directions in Ancient Pantomime,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 314-337.

Jauss, H. R. and Benzinger, E. (1970), 'Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory', *New Literary History* 2.1: 7-37.

John, J. (2001), *Dickens's Villains: Melodrama, Character, Popular Culture*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Johne, R. (1996), 'Women in the Ancient Novel', in G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, (Leiden: Brill) 151-207.

Johnson, W. A. (2010), *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire: A Study of Elite Communities*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Jones, C. P. (1991), 'Dinner Theater', in W. Slater (ed.), *Dining in a Classical Context*, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press) 185-198.
_____. (1992), 'La personnalité de Chariton', in M-F Baslez, P. Hofmann and M. Trédé (edd.), *Le monde du roman grec*, (Paris: 'École normale supérieure) 161-168.
_____. (1993), 'Greek Drama in the Roman Empire', in R. Scodel (ed.), *Theater and Society in the Ancient World*, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press) 39-52.

Jones, M. (2005), 'The Wisdom of Egypt: Base and Heavenly Magic in Heliodoros' *Aithiopika*', in S. Harrison, M. Paschalis and S. Frangoulidis (edd.), *Metaphor and the Ancient Novel, Ancient Narrative Supplementum* 4, (Groningen: Barkhuis and Groningen University Library) 79-98.

Jory, J. (1981), 'The literary evidence for the beginning of Imperial pantomime', *BICS* 28: 147-61.
_____. (1984), 'The Early Pantomime Riots', in A. Moffatt (ed.), *Maistor: Classical, Byzantine and Renaissance Studies for Robert Browning*, (Canberra: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies) 57-66.
_____. (1986), 'Continuity and Change in the Roman Theatre', in J.H. Betts, J.T. Hooker, and J.R. Green (edd.), *Studies in Honour of T.B.L. Webster*, vol 1., (Bristol: Bristol Classical Press) 143-52.
_____. (1996), 'The Drama of the Dance: Prolegomena to an Iconography of Imperial Pantomime', in W.J. Slater (ed.), *Roman Theater and Society*, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press) 1-27.
_____. (2002), 'The masks on the propylon of the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias', in P. Easterling and E. Hall (edd.), *Greek and Roman Actors: Aspects of an Ancient Profession*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 238-253.

Jucker, I. (1988), 'Euripides und der Mythos von Orest und Iphigenie in der bildenden Kunst', in B. Zimmermann (ed.), *Euripides, Iphigenie bei den Taurern, übersetzt von Georg Finsler*, (Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler) 105-38.

Junkelmann, M. (2000), '*Familia Gladiatoria*: Heroes of the Ampitheatre,' (A. Bell, trans.), in E. Köhne and C. Ewigleben (edd.), *Gladiators and Caesars: The Power of Spectacle in Ancient Rome*, (Berkeley: University of California Press) 31-74.

Kaimio, M. (1996), 'How to Enjoy a Greek Novel: Chariton Guiding His Audience', *Arctos* 30: 49-73.

Kapparis, K. (2000), 'Has Chariton read Lysias' 1 "On the Murder of Eratosthenes"?', *Hermes* 128: 380-383.

Kasprzyk, D. (2001), 'Théron, pirate, contour et narrateur dans le roman de Chariton, Chairéas et Callirhoé', in B. Pouderon (ed.), *Les personnages du roman grec,* (Lyons: Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée) 149-64.

Kavoulaki, A. (1999), 'Processional Performance and the Polis', in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (edd.), *Performance Culture and the Athenian Democracy,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 292-320.

Kehoe, P. H. (1984), 'The adultery mime reconsidered', in D. F. Bright and E. S. Ramage (edd.), *Classical Texts and their Traditions: Studies in Honor of C. R. Trahman,* (Chico: Scholars Press) 89-106.

Kelly, H. A. (1979), 'Tragedy and the Performance of Tragedy in Late Roman Antiquity', *Traditio* 35: 21-44.

Kennedy, G. (2003), *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, (Leiden: Brill).

Kim, L. (2013), 'Milesian Tales', in T. Whitmarsh and S. Thomson (edd.), *The Romance between Greece and the East*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 300-321.

Kokolakis, M. (1959), 'Pantomimus and the Treatise *Peri Orcheseos* (*De Saltatione*)', *Platon* 11: 3-56.

Kolb, F. (1981), *Agora und Theater, Volks- und Festversammlung*, (Berlin: Gebr. Mann).

Kondoleon, C. (1995), *Domestic and Divine: Roman Mosaics in the House of Dionysos*, (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press).

_____. (1999), 'Timing Spectacles: Roman Domestic Art and Performance', in B. Bergmann and C. Kondoleon (edd.), *The Art of Ancient Spectacle (Studies in the History of Art 56), Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts. Symposium Papers XXXIV*, (New Haven and London: National Gallery of Art Washington and Yale University Press) 321-41.

Konstan, D. (1988), 'The Tyrant Goddess: Herodas's Fifth "Mime"', *Classical Antiquity*, 8.2: 267-282.

_____. (1994), *Sexual Symmetry: Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

_____. (2009), 'The Active Reader and the Ancient Novel', in M. Paschalis, S. Panayotakis and G. Schmeling (edd.), *Readers and Writers in the Ancient Novel, Ancient Narrative Supplementum* 12, (Groningen: Barkhuis and Groningen University Library) 1-17.

Korenjak, M. (2000), *Publikum und Redner*, (München: C. H. Beck Verlag).

_____. (2003), 'Homer und die sophistische Rhetorik der Kaiserzeit', *Museum Helveticum* 60: 129-45.

Körte, A. 'Literarische Texte mit Ausschluß der christlichen', *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und Verwande Gebiete* 10: 19-70, 217-237.

Kristeva, J. (1974), *La Révolution du langage poétique. :L'Avant-Garde à la fin du XIXe siècle: Lautréamont et Mallarmé,* (Paris: Editions du Seuil).

Lada-Richards, I. (1993-1994), '"Empathic Understanding": Emotion and Cognition in Classical Dramatic Audience-Response', *PCPS* 39: 94-140.
_____. (1996), 'Emotion and Meaning in Tragic Performance', in M. Silk (ed.), *Tragedy and the Tragic,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 397-413.
_____. (1997), 'Neoptolemus and the Bow: Ritual Thea and Theatrical Vision in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*', *JHS* 117: 179-183.
_____. (1999), *Initiating Dionysus: Ritual and Theatre in Aristophanes'* Frogs, (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
_____. (2002), 'The Subjectivity of Greek Performance', in E. Hall and P.E. Wasterling (eds) *Greek and Roman Actors: Aspects of an Ancient Profession,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 395 - 418
_____. (2003), '"Within the Compasse of a Lye…": signs of antitheatricality on the Greek stage?', in E. Theodorakopoulos (ed.), *Attitudes to Theatre from Plato to Milton,* (Bari: Levante) 21-56.
_____. (2004), 'Authorial Voice and Theatrical Self-Definition in Terence and beyond: The "Hecyra" Prologues in Ancient and Modern Contexts', *Greece & Rome* 51.1: 55-82.
_____. (2007), *Silent Eloquence: Lucian and Pantomime Dancing,* (London: Duckworth).
_____. (2008), 'Was Pantomime "Good to Think With" in the Ancient World', in E. Hall and R. Wyles (edd.), *New Directions in Ancient Pantomime,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 284-313.
_____. (2009a), '"By Means of Performance": Western Greek Mythological Vase-Paintings, Tragic "Enrichment," and the Early Reception of Fifth-century Athenian Tragedy", Review Oliver Taplin, Pots and Plays, *Arion* 17.2: 99-166.
_____. (2009b), '"The players will tell all': the dramatist, the actors and the art of acting in Sophocles' Philoctetes", in S. Goldhill and E. Hall (eds), *Sophocles and the Greek Tragic Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 48-68.
_____. (2013), '*Mutata corpora*: Ovid's Changing Forms and the Metamorphic Bodies of Pantomime Dancing', *TAPA* 143: 105-152.

Laplace, M. (1980), "Les légendes troyennes dans le 'roman' de Chariton, Chairéas et Callirhoé,' *REG* 93: 83-125.
_____. (1997), 'Le roman de Chariton et la tradition de l'éloquence et de la rhétorique', *RhM,* 140: 38-71.
_____. (2007), *Le roman d'Achille Tatios,* (Bern: Peter Lang).

Lesky, A. (1966), 'Neroniana' in W. Kraus (ed.), *Gesammelte Schriften,* (Bern and München: Francke Verlag) 335-51.

Leppin, H. (1992), *Histrionen,* (Bonn: Habelt).

Leyerle, B. (2001), *Theatrical Shows and Ascetic Lives*, (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Liapis, V. J. (2006), 'Achilles Tatius as a reader of Sophocles', *Classical Quarterly* 56.1: 220-238.
_____. (2008), 'Achilles' Tatius and Sophocles' *Tereus*: A Corrigendum and an Addendum', *Classical Quarterly* 58.1: 335-6.

Lightfoot, J. (2002), 'Nothing to do with the *technîtai* of Dionysus?', in P. Easterling and E. Hall (edd.), *Greek and Roman Actors: Aspects of an Ancient Profession,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 212-24.

Linant de Bellefonds, P. (1990), 'Iphigeneia (époque romaine)', *LIMC* 5.1:719-29.

Ling, R. and L. Ling, (1997), *The Insula of the Menander at Pompeii,* vol. 2, *The Decorations*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Lim, R. (1999), 'In the "Temple of Laughter": Visual and Literary Representations of Spectators at Roman Games', in B. Bergmann and C. Kondoleon (edd.), *The Art of Ancient Spectacle (Studies in the History of Art 56), Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts. Symposium Papers XXXIV,* (New Haven and London: National Gallery of Art Washington and Yale University Press) 343-365.

Lissarrague, F. (2010), 'Visuality and Performance', in M.L. Hart (ed.), *The Art of Ancient Greek Theater*, (Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum) 53-56.

Litvak, J. (1992), *Caught in the Act: Theatricality in the Nineteenth-Century English Novel*, (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press).

Lofberg, J. O. (1920), 'The Sycophant-Parasite', *Classical Philology* 15.1: 61-72.

Longosz, S. (1997), 'I germi del dramma Cristiano nella letteratura patristica', *Studia Patristica* 31: 59-69.

MacKay, C. H., ed. (1989), *Dramatic Dickens,* (Eastleigh and London: Palgrave Macmillan).

MacKay, P. A. (1963), 'Klephtika: The Tradition of the Tales of Banditry in Apuleius', *Greece & Rome* 10: 147-152.

Manteuffel, G. (1929) 'Apparatus mimici libellus', *Eos* 32: 27-33.

Marinčič, M. (2007), 'Advertising One's Story. Text and Speech in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*' in V. Rimell (ed.), *Seeing Tongues, Hearing Scripts: Orality and Representation in the Ancient Novel, Ancient*

Narrative Supplementum 7, (Groningen: Barkhuis and Groningen University Library) 168-200.

Marini, N. (1993), 'Il personaggio di Calliroe come «nuova Elena» e la mediazione comica di un passo euripideo, Char. III 10- IV 1 = Hel. 11651300', *SIFCl* 11: 205-215.

Marino, E. (1990), 'Il teatro nel romanzo: Eliodoro e il codice spettacolare', *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 25: 203-218.

Martindale, C. (1993), *Redeeming the Text: Latin poetry and the hermeneutics of reception* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
_____. (2004) 'Introduction: Thinking Through Reception' in C. Martindale and R. F. Thomas (edd.), *Classics and the Uses of Reception*, (London: Blackwell) 1-13.

Martzavou, P. (2012), 'Review: Tim Whitmarsh, Narrative and Identity in the Ancient Greek Novel: Returning Romance. Greek culture in the Roman world', *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2012:02:20.

Mason, H. J. (2002), 'Chaereas in Chariton and New Comedy', *CB* 78: 21-7.

Mastromarco, G. (1984), *The Public of Herondas*, (Amsterdam: Brill).

Mattiacci, S. (1996), *Le Novelle Dell'Adulterio: Metamorfosi IX*, (Firenze: Le Lettere).

May, R. (2006), *Apuleius and Drama: The Ass on Stage*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
_____. (2008), 'Apuleius' *Judgement of Paris* (*Met.* 10.30-34)', in E. Hall and R. Wyles (edd.), *New Directions in Ancient Pantomime*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 338-362.

McGill, S. (2000), 'The Literary Lives of a Scheintod: "Clitophon and Leucippe" 5.7 and Greek Epigram', *The Classical Quarterly* 50.1: 323-6.

McKeown, J. (1979), 'Augustan Elegy and Mime', *PCPS* 25: 71-84.

Merkelbach, R. (1962), *Roman und Mysterium in der Antike*, (München and Berlin: C. H. Beck'sche verlagsbuchhandlung).

Mignogna, E. (1996a), 'Narrativa greca e mimo: il romanzo di Achille Tazio', *SIFC* 14:
232-242.
_____. (1996b), 'Il mimo 'Leucippe', *Rivista di Cultura Classica e Medioevale* 38: 161-6.
_____. (1997), 'Leucippe in Tauride (Ach. Tat. 3, 15-22): mimo e 'pantomimo' tra tragedia e romanzo', *MD* 38: 225-36.

Milanezi, S. (2004), 'À l'ombre des acteurs: les amuseurs à l'époque classique', in C. Hugoniot, F. Hurlet and S. Milanezi (edd.), *Le statut de l'acteur dans l'Antiquité grecque et romaine,* (Tours: Presses Universitaires François-Rabelais) 183-209.

Molloy, M. E. (1996), *Libanius and the Dancers*, (Hildesheim, Zurich and New York: Olms-Weidmann).

Montague, H. (1992) 'Sweet and Pleasant Passion: Female and Male Fantsy in Ancient Romance Novels', in A. Richlin (ed.) *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome,* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press), 231-49.

Montes Cala, J. G. (1992), 'En torno a la "impostura dramática" en la novela griega: comentario à una écfrasis de espectáculo en Heliodoro', *Habis* 23:217-235.

Montiglio, S. (1999) 'Paroles dansées en silence: L'Action signifiante de la pantomime et le moi du danseur', *Phoenix* 53.3-4: 263-80.
_____. (2011), 'Review: Stefan Tilg, *Chariton of Aphrodisias and the Invention of the Greek Novel', Ancient Narrative* 9: 153-6.
_____. (2012a), *Love and Providence: Recognition in the Ancient Novel*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
_____. (2012b), 'Review: Tim Whitmarsh, *Narrative and Identity in the Ancient Greek Novel. Returning Romance*.', *Ancient Narrative* 10: 151-8.

Moorman, E.M. (1983), 'Rappresentazioni teatrali su *scaenae frontes* di quarto stile a Pompei', *Pompeii Herculaneum Stabiae: Bolletino dell' associazione internazionale Amici di Pompei* I, 73-117.

Morales, H. (2000), 'Sense and Sententiousness in the Greek Novels', in A. Sharrock and H. Morales (edd.), *Intratextuality,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 67-88.
_____. (2004), *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tatius'* Leucippe and Clitophon, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
_____. (2005), 'Metaphor, Gender and the Ancient Novel', S. Harrison, M. Paschalis and S. Frangoulidis (edd.), *Metaphor and the Ancient Novel*, *Ancient Narrative Supplementum* 4, (Groningen: Barkhuis and Groningen University Library) 1-22.

Morgan, J. R. (1982), 'History, Romance and Realism in Heliodorus', *Classical Antiquity* 1.2: 221-265.
_____. (1989a), 'Heliodorus. An Ethiopian Story', in B.P. Reardon (ed.), *Collected Ancient Greek Novels,* (Berkeley: University of California Press) 349-588.
_____. (1989b), 'The Story of Knemon in Heliodorus' Aithiopika', *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 109: 99-113.
_____. (1989c), 'A Sense of the Ending: the Conclusion of Heliodoros' Aithiopika', *TAPA* 119: 299-320.

_____. (1991), ‘Reader and audiences in the Aithiopika of Heliodoros’, *GCN* 4: 85-103.
_____. (1993), ‘Make-believe and Make Believe: the fictionality of the Greek novels’, in C. Gill and T.P. Wiseman (edd.), *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World,* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press) 175-229.
_____ and Stoneman, R. (edd.) (1994a), *Greek fiction: the Greek novel in context,* (London and New York: Routledge).
_____. (1994b), ‘The Aithiopika of Heliodoros: Narrative as Riddle’, in J.R. Morgan and R. Stoneman (edd.) *Greek fiction: the Greek novel in context* (London and New York: Routledge) 97-113.
_____. (1995) ‘The Greek Novel: Towards a Sociology of Production and Reception’, in A. Powell (ed.), *The Greek World,* (London and New York: Routledge) 130-52.
_____. (1996a), ‘Heliodoros’, in G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, (Leiden: Brill) 417- 456.
_____. (1996b), ‘The Novel at the End of the Century: Scholarship since the Dartmouth Conference’, *Classical Philology* 91.1: 63-73.
_____. (1998), ‘On the Fringes of the Canon: Work on the Fragments of Ancient Greek Fiction 1936– 1994’, *ANRW* II.34.4: 3293-3390.
_____. (2007), ‘Kleitophon and Encolpius: Achilleus Tatius as hidden author’, in M. Paschalis, S. Frangoulidis, S. Harrison and M. Zimmerman (edd.), *The Greek and Roman Novel: Parallel Readings, Ancient Narrative Supplementum* 8, (Groningen: Barkhuis and Groningen University Library) 105-120.
_____. (2008a), ‘Foreword to the 2008 Edition’, in B. P. Reardon (ed.), *Collected Ancient Greek Novels,* (Berkeley: University of California Press) ix-xix.
_____. (2008b), ‘Intertextuality: The Greek Novel’, in T. Whitmarsh (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman Novel,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 218-227.

Müller, C. W. (1976), ‘Chariton von Aphrodisias und die Theorie des Romans in der Antike’, *A&A* 22: 115-36.

Neimke, P. (1889), *Quaestiones Heliodorae,* (Halle: Buchdruckerei des Waisenhauses).

Nicoll, A. (1931), *Masks, Mimes and Miracles,* (London: Harcourt, Brace and Company).

Nickau, K. (1966), ‘Epeisodion und Episode: Zu einem Begriff der aristotelischen Poetik’, *Mus. Helv.* 23: 155-171.

Nimis, S. (1994), ‘The Prosaics of the Ancient Novel’, *Arethusa* 27: 387-411.
_____. (1999), ‘The Sense of Open-endedness in the Ancient Novel’, *Arethusa* 32: 215-238.
_____. (2003), ‘*In mediis rebus*: Beginning Again in the Middle of the Ancient Novel’, in S. Panayotakis, M. Zimmerman and W. Keulen (edd.), *The Ancient Novel and Beyond,* (Leiden and Boston: Brill) 255-269.

_____. (2009) ‘Cite and Sound: The Prosaics of Quotation in the Ancient Novel’, in M. Paschalis, S. Panayotakis and G. Schmeling (edd.), *Readers and Writers in the Ancient Novel, Ancient Narrative Supplementum* 12, (Groningen: Barkhuis and Groningen University Library) 79-90.

Ormand, K. (2010) ‘Testing Virginity in Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus’, *Ramus* 39.2: 160–192.

O’Sullivan, J. (1976), ‘Euripides IA 1550 and Achilles Tatius 3.14.3’, *AJP* 97.2: 111-113.
_____. (1995), *Xenophon of Ephesus: His Compositional Technique and the Birth of the Novel*, (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter).

Oudot, E. (1992), ‘Images d’Athènes dans les Romans Grecs’, in M-F Baslez, P. Hofmann and M. Trédé (edd.), *Le monde du roman grec* (Paris: École normale supérieure) 101-111.

Panayotakis, C. (1995), *Theatrum Arbitri: Theatrical Elements in the Satyrica of Petronius*, (Leiden: Brill).
_____. (2008), ‘Virgil on the Popular Stage’, in E. Hall and R. Wyles (edd.), *New Directions in Ancient Pantomime* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 185-197.
_____. (2010), *Decimus Laberius: The Fragments*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Papadopoulou, T. (1999), ‘Literary Theory and Terminology in the scholia: the case of πλασμα’, *BICS* 43: 203-10.

Papanikolaou, A. (1973), *Chariton-Studien*, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Parker, H. N. (2009), ‘Books and Reading Latin Poetry’ in W.A. Johnson and H.N. Parker (edd.), *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 186-229.

Paschalis, M. (2013) ‘The Basic Plot of Callirhoe: History, Myth and Aristotelian Poetics’, in M. Paschalis and S. Panayotakis (edd.), *The Construction of the Real and the Ideal in the Ancient Novel*, AN Supplementum 17, (161-77).

Parrish, D. (1995), ‘The Architectural Design and Interior Décor of Apartment I in Insula 2 at Ephesus’, in R. Ling (ed.), *Fifth National Colloquium on Ancient Mosaic* 2, *JRA* Supplementum 9, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press) 143-58.

Parsons, P. (1971), ‘A Greek *Satyricon*?’, *BICS* 18: 53-68.

Paulsen, T. (1992). *Inszenierung des Schicksals : Tragödie und Komödie im Roman des Heliodor*, (Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag).

Pecere, O. and A. Stramaglia (1996), *La letteratura di consumo nel mondo greco-latino,* (Cassino: Levante).

Pernot, L. (1992), 'Charicléa la sirène', in M-F Baslez, P. Hofmann and M. Trédé (edd.), *Le monde du roman grec,* (Paris: 'École normale supérieure) 43-51.

Perrone, S. (2011), 'Back to the backstage: the papyrus P.Berol. 13927', *Trends in Classics* 3.1: 126–153.

Perry, B. E. (1930), 'Chariton and his romance from a literary-historical point of view', *AJP* 51: 93-134.
_____. (1967), *The Ancient Romances: A Literary-Historical Account of their Origins,* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press).

Petrides, A. (2003), 'Talking (from) baskets: Epicharmus fr. 123 K.-A.', *Eikasmos* 14: 75-86.

Philippides, S. (1988), 'Lovers' fate: narrator's providence in Chaereas and Callirhoe', in R. Beaton (ed.), *The Greek Novel AD 1-1985,* (Beckenham: Routledge) 182-9.

Plass, P. (1995), *The Game of Death in Ancient Rome: arena sport and political suicide,* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press).

Plepelits, K. (1976), *Chariton von Aphrodisias*. *Kallirhoe*, (Stuttgart: Hiersemann).
_____. (1980), *Achilleus Tatios. Leukippe und Kleitophon* (Stuttgart: Hiersemann).
_____. (1996), 'Achilles Tatius', in G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, (Leiden: Brill) 387–416.

Pletcher, J. A. (1998), 'Euripides in Heliodoros' *Aithiopika* 7-8', *GCN* 9: 17-27.

Pollitt, J.J. (1986), *Art in the Hellenistic Age*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Porter, J.R. (1997), 'Murder by the Book: Lysias 1 ("On the Murder of Eratosthenes")', *EMC* n.s. 16: 421-453.
_____. (2003), 'Chariton and Lysias 1: Further Considerations', *Hermes* 131: 431-440.

Porter, S. (ed.) (2007), *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period: 330 B.C.-A.D. 400,* (Leiden: Brill).

Potter, D. (1993), 'Martyrdom as Spectacle', in R. Scodel (ed.), *Theater and Society in the Classical World,* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press) 53-88.

_____. (2010), ‘Entertainers in the Roman Empire’, in D. Potter and D.J. Mattingly (edd.), *Life, Death and Entertainment in the Roman Empire,* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press) 280-349.

Prescott, H. W. (1918), ‘The Antecedents of Hellenistic Comedy’, *Classical Philology* 13.2: 113-137.

Price, S. R. F. (1984), *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Puccini-Delbey, G. (2001), ‘Figures du narrateur et du narrataire dans les oeuvres romanesques de Chariton d’Aphrodisias, Achille Tatius et Apulée’, in B. Pouderon (ed.), *Les personnages du roman grec,* (Lyons: Maison de l’Orient et de la Méditerranée) 87-100.

Quet, M-H. (1992), ‘Romans grecs, mosaïques romaines’, in M-F Baslez, P. Hofmann and M. Trédé (edd.), *Le monde du roman grec,* (Paris: ‘École normale supérieure) 125-158.

Reardon, B.P., (1976) ‘Aspects of the Greek Novel’, *Greece & Rome* 23.2:118-131.
_____. (ed.) (1990), *Collected Ancient Greek Novels,* (Berkeley: University of California Press).
_____. (1991), *The Form of Greek Romance,* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
_____. (1994), ‘Achilles Tatius and Ego-Narrative’, in J.R. Morgan and R. Stoneman (edd.), *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*, (London and New York: Routledge) 80-96.
_____. (1996), ‘Chariton’, in G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World,* (Leiden: Brill) 309-335.
_____. (1999), ‘Theme, Structure, and Narrative in Chariton’, in S. Swain (ed.), *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 163-188.

Reich, H. (1903), *Der Mimus: ein litterar- entwickelungsgeschichtlicher Versuch,* (Berlin: Weidmann).

Repath, I. (2005), ‘Achilles Tatius’ *Leucippe and Cleitophon*: What Happened Next?’, *CQ* 55: 250-265.
_____. (2007), ‘Emotional Conflict and Platonic Psychology in the Greek Novel’, in M. Jones and J. Morgan (edd.), *Philosophical Presences in the Greek Novel*, *Ancient Narrative Supplementum* 10, (Groningen: Barkhuis and Groningen University Library) 53-84.
_____. (2010), ‘Plato in Petronius: Petronius in platanona’, *Classical Quarterly* 60.1: 577-95.
_____. (2011) ‘Platonic Love and Erotic Education in Longus’ Daphnis and Chloe’, in K. Doulamis (ed.), *Echoing Narratives: Studies of Intertextuality in Greek and Roman Prose Fiction*, *Ancient Narrative Supplementum* 13, (Groningen: Barkhuis and Groningen University Library) 99-122.

Reynolds, R. W. (1946), 'The Adultery Mime', *The Classical Quarterly* 40. ¾: 77-84.

Richlin, A. (1992), 'Reading Ovid's Rapes', in A. Richlin (ed.), *Pornography and Representation in Grece & Rome,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 158-179.

Rijksbaron, A. (1984), 'Chariton 8,1,4 und Aristot. Poet. 1449 b 28', *Philologus* 128: 306-7.

Ringer, M. (1998), *Electra and the Empty Urn. Metatheater and Role Playing in Sophocles*, (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press).

Robert, F. (2012), 'La représentation de la pantomime dans les romans grecs et latins: les exemples de Longus e d'Apulée', *DHA* 38.1: 87-110.

Robert, L. (1930), 'Pantomimen im grieschischen Orient', *Hermes* 65: 106-22.
_____. (1984), 'Discours d'ouverture', in Πρακτίκα του Η᾽ Ελληνικής και Λατινικής επιγραφικής, Αθήνα, 3-9 Οκτωβρίου 1982, τόμος Α᾽, (Athens: Υπουργειο Πολιτισμου και Επιστημων) 35-45.

Robiano, P. (1984), 'La notion de Tyché chez Chariton et chez Héliodore', *REG* 97: 543-9.
_____. (2000), 'La citation poétique dans le roman érotique grec', *REA* 102: 509–29.

Rohde, E. (1914), *Der Griechische Roman und seine Vorlaufer,* (Hildesheim: Olms).

Roncali, R. (1991), 'Zelotypia/daimon in Caritone', *QS* 17.34: 183-6.

Rose, M. A. (1979), *Parody/Meta-fiction,* (London: Croom Helm).

Rotolo, V. (1957), 'Il Pantomimo: Studi e testi', *Atti della Accademia di Scienze Lettere e Arte di Palermo* vol. 16, (Palermo: Presso l'Accademia) 221-347.

Roueché, C. (1993), *Performers and Partisans at Aphrodisias in the Roman and Late Roman Periods: A Study based on Inscriptions from the Current Excavations at Aphrodisias in Caria,* (London: Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies).
_____. (2002), 'New evidence from Ephesus', in P. Easterling and E. Hall (edd.), *Greek and Roman Actors: Aspects of an Ancient Profession,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 254-281.

Ruiz-Montero, C. (1991a), 'Caritón de Afrodisias y los Ejercicios Preparatorios de Elio Teón'. In L. Ferreres (ed.) *Actes del IXe Simposi de la Secció Catalana de la SEEC Treballs en Honor de Virgilio Bejarano* 2, (Barcelona: Universidad de Barcelona) 709-713.
_____. (1991b), 'Aspects of the Vocabulary of Chariton of Aphrodisias', *CQ* 4: 484-89.

_____. (1994a), 'Chariton von Aphrodisias: ein Überblick', *ANRW* II 34.2 1006-1054.
_____. (1994b), 'Xenophon von Ephesos: ein Überblick', *ANRW* II 34.2 1088-1138.
_____. (1996), 'The Rise of the Greek Novel', in G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, (Leiden: Brill) 29-87.

Russell, D. A. (1983), *Greek Declamation*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Saïd, S. (1992), 'Les langues du roman grec', in M-F Baslez, P. Hofmann and M. Trédé (edd.), *Le monde du roman grec*, (Paris: 'École normale supérieure) 169-186.
_____. (1994), 'The City in the Greek Novel' in J. Tatum (ed.), *The Search for the Ancient Novel*, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press) 216-236.

Salomon, R. (1991), 'Epigraphic Remains of Indian Traders in Egypt', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 111.4: 731-6.

Sandy, G. (1974), 'Scaenica Petroniana', *TAPA* 104: 329-346.
_____. (1982a), *Heliodorus*, (Boston: Twayne Publishers).
_____. (1982b), 'Characterization and Philosophical Decor in Heliodorus' Aethiopica' *TAPA* 112: 141-167.
_____. (1997), *The Greek World of Apuleius*, (Leiden: Brill).

Santelia, S. (1991), *Charition Liberata (P. Oxy. 413)*, (Bari: Levante).

Schlapbach, K. (2008), 'Lucian's *On Dancing* and the Models for a Discourse on Pantomime', in E. Hall and R. Wyles (edd.), *New Directions in Ancient Pantomime*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 314-337.

Schlicke, P. (1985), *Dickens and Popular Entertainment*, (London: Allen & Unwin).

Schmeling, G. (1974), *Chariton*, (New York: Twayne Publishers).
_____. (2005), 'Callirhoe: God-like Beauty and the Making of a Celebrity', in S. Harrison, M. Paschalis and S. Frangoulidis (edd.), *Metaphor and the Ancient Novel*, *Ancient Narrative Supplementum* 4, (Barkhuis and Groningen University Library) 36-49.
_____. (ed.) (2006), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, (Leiden: Brill).
_____. (2011), *A Commentary on the* Satyrica *of Petronius*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Schmitz, T. (1997), *Bildung und Macht*, (München: C. H. Beck Verlag).

Schwartz, S. (2000-2001), 'Clitophon the Moichos: Achilles Tatius and the Trial Scene in the Greek Novel', *Ancient Narrative* 1: 93-113.
_____. (2007), 'From Bedroom to Courtroom: The Adultery Type-Scene and the Acts of Andrew', in T. Penner and C. Vander Stichele (edd.), *Mapping Gender in Ancient Religious Discourse*, (Leiden: Brill) 267-311.

_____. (2010), 'Chronotopes of Justice in the Greek Novel: Trials in Literary Spaces', in F. de Angelis (ed.), *Spaces of Justice in the Roman World,* (Leiden and Boston: Brill) 331-356.

Scobie, A. (1969), *Aspects of the Ancient Romance and its Heritage. Essays on Apuleius, Petronius, and the Greek Romances*, (Meisenheim am Glan: Anton Hain).
_____. (1979) '*Storytellers, Storytelling and the Novel in Graeco-Roman Antiquity*', *RhM* 122: 229-259.
_____. (1983) *Apuleius and Folklore: Toward a History of ML3045, AaTh567, 449A*, (London: Folklore Society).

Scodel, R. (1997), 'Drama and Rhetoric', S. Porter (ed.), *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period: 330 B.C.-A.D. 400,* (Leiden: Brill) 489-504.

Scourfield, J. H. D. (2003), 'Anger and Gender in Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*', in S. Braund and G. Most (edd.), *Ancient Anger: Perspectives from Homer to Galen*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 163-184.
_____. (2010), 'Chaereas, Hippolytus, Theseus: Tragic Echoes, Tragic Potential in Chariton', *Phoenix* 64.3: 291-313.

Seaford, R. (1996), *Euripides'* Bacchae, (Warminster: Aris & Phillips)

Segal, C. (1996), 'Catharsis, Audience, and Closure in Greek Tragedy', in M. Silk (ed.), *Tragedy and the Tragic*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press) 149-72.
_____. (1982), *Dionysian Poetics and Euripides' Bacchae,* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Selden, D. (1994), 'Genre of Genre', in J. Tatum (ed.), *The Search for the Ancient Novel*, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press) 39-64.

Shaw, B.D. (1984), 'Bandits in the Roman Empire', *P&P* 105: 3- 52.

Sharrock, A. and Morales, H. (2000), *Intratextuality*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Shorrock, R. (2001), *The Challenge of Epic: Allusive Engagement in the* Dionysiaca *of Nonnus*, (Leiden, Boston and Köln: Brill).

Sifakis, G. M. (1967), *Studies in the History of Hellenistic Drama*, (London: Athlone Press).

Slater, N. (1990), *Reading Petronius*, Baltimore.
_____. (2003), 'Spectator and Spectacle', in S. Panayotakis, M. Zimmerman and W. Keulen (edd.), *The Ancient Novel and Beyond,* (Leiden and Boston: Brill) 85-100.

Smith, S. D. (2005), 'Bakhtin and Chariton: A Revisionist Reading', in R. B. Branham (ed.), *The Bakhtin Circle and Ancient Narrative, Ancient*

Narrative Supplementum 3, (Groningen: Barkhuis and Groningen University Library) 164-192.
_____. (2007), *Greek Identity and the Athenian Past in Chariton: The Romance of Empire*, (Groningen: Barkhuis and Groningen University Library).

Starr, R. J. (1987), 'Trimalchio's *Homeristae*', *Latomus* 46: 199-200.

Stefani, G. (2003), *Menander: La Casa del Menandro di Pompei*, (Milan: Electa).

Stefanis, I. E. (1988), Διονυσιακοὶ Τεχνῖται, (Heraklion: P.E.K.).

Stephens, S. A. (1994), 'Who Read Ancient Novels?', in J. Tatum (ed.), *The Search for the Ancient Novel*, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press) 405-418.
_____ and Winkler, J. J. (edd.) (1995), *Ancient Greek Novels: The Fragments*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
_____. (2003), 'Fragments of Lost Novels', in G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, (Leiden: Brill) 655-83.

Strocka, V. M. (1977), *Die Wandmalerei der Hanghäuser Ephesos*, 2 vols, (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften).

Swain, S. (1992), 'Novel and Pantomime in Plutarch's "Antony"', *Hermes* 120: 76-82.

Taplin, O. (1999), 'Spreading the Word through Performance', in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (edd.), *Performance Culture and the Athenian Democracy*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 33-57.
_____. (2007), *Pots & plays : interactions between tragedy and Greek vase-painting of the fourth century B.C.*, (Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum).

Tatum, J., ed. (1994), *The Search for the Ancient Novel*, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press).

Telò, M. (2011), 'The Eagle's Gaze in the Opening of the Aethiopica', *AJP* 132.4: 581-613.

Theocharidis, G. (1940), *Beiträge zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Profantheaters im IV. und V. Jahrhundert, hauptsächlich auf Grund der Predigten des Johannes Chrysostomos, Partriarchen von Konstantinopel*, (Thessaloniki: Triantaphyllou).

Tilg, S. (2010), *Chariton of Aphrodisias and the Invention of the Greek Love Novel*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Tompkins, J. (1980a), 'An Introduction to Reader-Response Criticism', in J. Tompkins (ed.), *Reader-Response Criticism: From Formalism to Post-structuralism*, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press) ix-xxvi.

_____. (1980b), ‘The reader in history’, in J. Tompkins (ed.), *Reader-Response Criticism: From Formalism to Post-structuralism,* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press) 201-232.

Trenkner, S. (1958), *The Greek Novella*, (Cambridge: University Press).

Trzaskoma, S.M. (2009), ‘Aristophanes in Chariton’, *Philologus* 153.3: 351-53.
_____. (2010), ‘Chariton and Tragedy: Reconsiderations and New Evidence’, *AJP* 131.2, 219-231.

Tsitsiridis, S. (2011), ‘Greek Mime in the Roman Empire (P.Oxy. 413)’, *Logeion* 1: 184-232.

van Mal-Maeder, D. (2007), *La fiction des déclamations, Mnemosyne Supplementa 290*, (Leiden and Boston: Brill).

van Nijf, O. (2001), ‘Local heroes: athletics, festivals and elite self-fashioning in the Roman East’, in S. Goldhill (ed.), *Being Greek under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 306-334.

Van Steen, G. (1998), ‘Destined to be? Tyche in Chariton’s *Chaereas and Callirhoe* and in the Byzantine romance of *Kallimachos and Chrysorro*i’, *AC* 67: 203-11.

Vanderspoel, J. 2007. ‘Hellenistic Rhetoric in Theory and Practice’, in I. Worthington (ed.), *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric,* (Malden and Oxford: Blackwell) 124-138.

Vasaly, A. (1993), *Representations: Images of the World in Ciceronian Oratory*, (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Veyne, P. (1989), ‘ΔΙΑΣΚΕΥΑΙ: Le théâtre grec sous l’empire’, *REG* 102: 339-345.

Vlock, D. (1998), *Dickens, Novel Reading and the Victorian Popular Theatre*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Walden, J.W.H. (1894), ‘Stage-Terms in Heliodorus’s Aethiopica’, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 5:1-43.

Walker, A. (1993), ‘*Enargeia* and the spectator in Greek Historiography’, *TAPA* 123: 356-77.

Watson, P. A. (1995), *Ancient Stepmothers: myth, misogyny and reality*, (Leiden: Brill).

Webb, R. (1997a), ‘Poetry and Rhetoric’, in S. Porter (ed.), *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period: 330 B.C.-A.D. 400,* (Leiden: Brill) 339-369.

_____. (1997b), ‘Imagination and the arousal of the emotions in Greco-Roman Rhetoric’, in S. Morton Braund and C. Gill (edd.), *The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
_____. (2002), ‘Female performers in late antiquity’, in P. Easterling and E. Hall (edd.), *Greek and Roman Actors: Aspects of an Ancient Profession,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 189-206.
_____. (2005), ‘The Protean Performer: Mimesis and Identity in Late Antique Discussions of the Theater,’, in Del Giudice, L. and van Deusen, N. (edd.), *Performing Ecstasies: Music, Dance, and Ritual in the Mediterranean,* (Ottawa: Institute of Mediaeval Music) 3-11.
_____. (2006), ‘Fiction, *Mimesis* and the Performance of the Greek Past in the Second Sophistic’, in D. Konstan and S. Saïd (edd.), *Greek and Greekness: Viewing the Greek Past Under the Roman Empire,* (Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society) 27-46.
_____. (2007), ‘Rhetoric and the Novel: Sex, Lies and Sophistic’, in I. Worthington (ed.), *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric,* (Malden and Oxford: Blackwell) 526-41.
_____. (2008), *Demons and Dancers,* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press).
_____. (2009), *Ekphrasis, Imagination and persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice*, (Surrey: Ashgate).
_____. (2013), ‘Mime and the Romance’, in T. Whitmarsh and S. Thomson (edd.), *The Romance between Greece and the East,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 285-99.

Wesseling, B. (1988), ‘The Audience of the Ancient Novel’, *GCN* 1: 67-79.

Whitmarsh, T. (2001), *Leucippe and Clitophon* (Oxford : Oxford University Press).
_____. (2003), ‘Reading for Pleasure: Narrative, Irony, and Erotics in Achilles Tatius’, in S. Panayotakis, M. Zimmerman and W. Keulen (edd.), *The Ancient Novel and Beyond,* (Leiden and Boston: Brill) 191-205.
_____. (ed.) (2005), *The Second Sophistic,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
_____. (ed.) (2008), *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman Novel,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
_____. (2009), ‘Divide and Rule: Segmenting Callirhoe and Related Works’, in M. Paschalis, S. Panayotakis and G. Schmeling (edd.), *Readers and Writers in the Ancient Novel,* (Groningen: Barkhuis and Groningen University Library) 36-50.
_____. (2011), *Narrative and Identity in the Ancient Greek Novel: returning romance,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
_____. (2012), ‘Whitmarsh on Martzavou on Whitmarsh, Narrative and Identity in the Ancient Greek Novel. Response to 2012.02.20’, *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2012:02:54.
_____ and Thomson, S. (edd.), (2013), *The Romance between Greece and the East,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Wiemken, H. (1972), *Der griechische Mimus : Dokumente zur Geschichte des antiken Volkstheaters,* (Bremen: Schunemann Universitatsverlag).

Wiles, D. (1991), *The Masks of Menander*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Wilson, P. (2000), *The Athenian institution of the Khoregia: the chorus, the city and the stage*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Winkler, J.J. (1980) 'Lollianos and the Desperadoes', *JHS* 100: 155–81.
_____. (1982), 'The Mendacity of Kalasiris and the Narrative Strategy of Heliodoros' *Aithiopika'*, *Yale Classical Studies* 27: 93-158.
_____. (1985), *Auctor & Actor : a narratological reading of Apuleius' Golden Ass*, (Berkeley: University of California Press).
_____. (1989), 'Leucippe and Clitophon', in B. Reardon (ed.), *Collected Ancient Greek Novels,* (Berkeley: University of California Press) 170-284.
_____. (1994), 'The Invention of Romance' , in J. Tatum (ed.), *The Search for the Ancient Novel,* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press) 23-38.

Winkler, M. (2001) 'The Cinematic Nature of the Opening of Heliodoros' *Aithiopika*', *Ancient Narrative* 1: 161-184.

Wise, J. (2008), 'Tragedy "as an Augury of a Happy Life"', *Arethusa* 41.3: 381-410.

Wiseman, T. P. (1985a), *Catullus and his World*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
_____. (1985b), 'Who was Crassicius Pansa?', *TAPA* 115: 187-96.
_____. (2008), '"Mime" and "Pantomime": Some Problematic Texts', in E. Hall and R. Wyles (edd.), *New Directions in Ancient Pantomime,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 146-153.

Wooten, C. W. (1976), 'Petronius, the Mime and Rhetorical Education', *Helios* 3:67-74.

Worthington, I. (ed.) (2007), *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric* (Malden and Oxford: Blackwell).

Yatromanolakis, Y. (1988), 'Baskanos Eros: Love and the Evil-Eye in Heliodorus' Aethiopica', in R. Beaton (ed.), *The Greek Novel AD 1-1985*, (Beckenham: Routledge) 194-204.

Zanetto, G. (1990), 'Il romanzo greco: Lingua e pubblico', in J. Tatum and G. M. Vernazza (edd.), *The Ancient Novel: Classical Paradigms and Modern Perspectives,* (Hanover, NH: Darthmouth College) 147-48.

Zanker, G. (1981), 'Enargeia in the Ancient Criticism of Poetry', *RhMus* 124: 297-311.
_____. (2009), Herodas *Mimiambs*, (Oxford: Aris and Phillips).

Zanobi, A. (2008), 'The Influence of Pantomime on Seneca's Tragedies', in E. Hall and R. Wyles (edd.), *New Directions in Ancient Pantomime,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 227-57.

Zeitlin, F. (1994), 'The artful eye: vision, ecphrasis and spectacle in Euripidean theatre' in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (edd.), *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 138-196.

_____. (2003), 'Living Portraits and Sculpted Bodies in Chariton's Theater of Romance', in S. Panayotakis, M. Zimmerman and W. Keulen (edd.), *The Ancient Novel and Beyond,* (Leiden and Boston: Brill) 71-83.

Zimmerman, M. (1999), 'When Phaedra left the Tragic Stage: Generic Switches in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses',* in B. Roest and H. Vanstiphout (edd.), *Aspects of Genre and Type in Pre-modern Literary Cultures,* (Groningen: Styx) 101-127.

Zimmermann, B. (2008) 'Seneca and Pantomime', in E. Hall and R. Wyles (edd.), *New Directions in Ancient Pantomime,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 218-26.